13695

BARODA INTRIGUES

AND

BOMBAY KHUTPUT;

BEING AN EXPOSITION OF THE FALLACIES, ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS, AND PARTIAL QUOTATIONS, RECENTLY PROMULGATED BY

MR. LESTOCK ROBERT REID;

IN A

27993

"LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS."

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL OUTRAM, C.B.

Late Resident at Baroda.

RR-l-11

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

PRINTED *(for private circulation,)* BY

SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 65, CORNHILL, LONDON.

1853.

Digitized with financial assistance from NSDL Technology Trust & Reach on 07 January, 2017

২৭৭৭৩

PREFACE.

THE Letter to the Chairmen of the Honorable Court f Directors of the East India Company, placed at the ommencement of the following pages, explains the cir- umstances under which they were written. It will lso suggest an explanation of the fact that four-fifths f the present Pamphlet have been in print for many eeks.

Conscious of his own literary imperfections, the uthor has freely availed himself of the readily accorded d of several of his friends; but for all that is stated the following pages he, and he alone, is responsible.

954.03
Out/Bad
27993

RUSSELL ELLICE, ESQ. AND MAJOR OLIPHANT,

CHAIRMEN OF THE HONORABLE COURT OF DIRECTORS OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

ORIENTAL CLUB, June 15th, 1853.

SIRS,

I respectfully solicit your acceptance of the accompanying printed document, containing a refutation of certain statements and insinuations to my prejudice, promulgated by Mr. Lestock Robert Reid, late of the Bombay Civil Service, in a Letter addressed by him to the Editor of the Daily News.

Soon after the publication of that Letter, I intimated to Mr. Reid my intention to publish a vindication of myself from its allegations. But the representations of several friends to whose judgment I deemed it my duty to defer, induced me for awhile to forego my original intention. They urged—and it appeared to me with much reason—that only those who had already studied the Parliamentary Papers relative to Baroda, were likely to peruse the effusions either of Mr. Reid or

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY EXPLANATIONS.

On the 30th of June 1852, the House of Commons, on the motion of Mr. Anstey, ordered a return of—

"Copies of all Correspondence and Papers on the subject of Colonel Outram's removal from the office of Resident at the Court of the Guicowar; or on the alleged corruption of Officers of the Bombay Government with bribes from Baroda."

Late in October, the Return was published.* On the 23rd, 24th, and 25th December its contents were subjected to analytical and critical notice in the "Daily News." And, on the 31st of January 1853, these Notices, revised, enlarged, and corrected throughout, were republished in the form of a Pamphlet, bearing the signature of "Indus."†

The original critiques contained very severe strictures on the conduct of several high Indian functionaries. The Pamphlet of "Indus" was still more specific in its charges, and copious in its illustrations. Foremost amongst those on whom judgment was passed, stood Mr. Lestock Robert Reid, late Member of the Bombay Council. And on the 2nd of March that gentleman put forth a "LETTER" to the Editor of the "Daily News," in

---

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 560, of Session of 1852.

† BOMBAY BRIBERIES, a Tale of the Present Charter. Inscribed to the Right Hon. Sir C. Wood, Bart., M.P., President of the Board of Control. By "Indus." Effingham Wilson, 11, Royal Exchange, London.

which he professed to prove that the allegations of "Indus" were "the result of mingled ignorance, rancour, and mendacity." *

How far Mr. Reid has justified those assertions—whether his Pamphlet contains an "Answer" to "Indus," or supplies a satisfactory vindication of himself, are questions with which I have no concern. And had he not gratuitously assailed my character while professing to defend his own, I should gladly have abstained from adding to the discomforts of his present position. As it is, I am compelled to notice, repel, and demonstrate the unwarrantable nature of his attacks. Not because they *are* attacks—for I have neither inclination nor the pecuniary means requisite for entering the lists with ordinary assailants—but because they are the attacks of Mr. Lestock Robert Reid,—of a gentleman enjoying high reputation as an able Indian administrator—of a *ci-devant* Governor of Bombay—of a candidate for a seat in the East Indian Direction, whose allegations cannot fail, if unrefuted, to find acceptance with the Proprietary Body and the public at large—and of one whose known position at the India House is calculated to impress his readers with the erroneous belief that he would not have ventured to assail me as he has done, without the secret concurrence of my honorable masters.

If in the performance of a duty, which Mr. Reid has imposed on me, I am constrained to enter into details which may embarrass himself and distress his friends, with him, not with me, rests the blame. He has himself announced that he could only vindicate his own character by casting reflections on mine. And if, in disposing of these, I shall chance to leave him in a worse position than that in which "Indus" found him, I shall at least not be amenable to the charge of unprovoked assault, from which *he* will find it difficult to relieve himself.

Mr. Reid's attacks on me are scattered over the whole of his

---

* Letter to the editor of the "Daily News," in answer to certain remarks contained in three chapters on Baroda affairs, which appeared in that journal on the 23rd, 24th, and 25th December, 1852, and have since been re-published in a pamphlet signed "Indus;" by Lestock R. Reid, Esq., late member of Council, Bombay.—London, Smith, Elder, and Co., 65, Cornhill.

Pamphlet. Thus, at page 9, he describes me as wantonly, or through ignorance, libelling an intelligent, and withal estimable race of men; and as having been, from my entire ignorance of the vernaculars of Guzerat, placed entirely at the mercy of interpreters. At page 10 he accuses me of an injustice towards himself, involving "folly and unfairness." At page 14, he cites, as a fact which "should be especially remarked," that though in my official reports to Government I made "sweeping assertions of *rumours* in Baroda," to his disadvantage, none of these were made till after he had left India. At page 18 he charges me with having made, in my Reports, "unfair" allusions to a letter which he admits to have received, and in which it was intimated to him, that it would be for his advantage to procure from the Government of which he was a member, decisions in favour of a notoriously corrupt and fraudulent banking house at Baroda. At page 19 he declares that I did not hesitate to use this letter "tortuously." At page 20 he attributes to me an "observation that the Government ought to have assumed" the authorship of that letter "without a shadow of proof"; and other observations "too absurd to require further comment." At page 25 he credits me with an "extraordinary partiality" to anonymous petitions. At page 30 he *implies* that I was on terms of intimacy with the corrupt clerks in the Secretariat, whose malpractices I at length induced the Government to acknowledge; and that I sought and obtained from them that illegitimate information which I afterwards convicted them of selling to the Baroda corruptionists. At page 33 he accuses me of being constantly in the habit of resorting to "a species of the very 'Khutput' which I have been since so earnest in denouncing." At page 36 he pronounces me guilty of having failed to communicate to Government knowledge of which I was in possession, "on an occasion when it was most essentially my duty to do so." At page 41 he attributes to me "disappointed ambition, wounded vanity, inordinate self opinion, honest though perverted views, &c., &c." At page 47, he accuses me of having described a certain individual to have been his confidential clerk, notwithstanding that I knew the statement to

be false. At page 45, he affirms that I suffered myself to be guided by a native who "had little difficulty in inducing me to believe anything:" and at page 64, he reproduces this charge in another form, *insinuating* that the native referred to was permitted to "wield my influence as Resident." At page 61, he describes me as considering that "it was the sole duty of the Bombay Government to carry out my wishes and obey my suggestions to the letter; and that it was a crime to hesitate to act as I desired, even if my desires might seem opposed to all law and justice." On the same page, he charges me—not, indeed, in direct terms, but by implication—with "credulity, prejudice, want of temper and discretion;" and with the far more serious moral turpitude of complicity with "a strong and violent party, who have not hesitated, *in his absence*,* to resort to all means short of actual accusation of corruption, including appeals to the local press, to cast a slur on his character." At page 63, he attributes to me the disgrace of having made official use of information of the untruth of which "I must have been well satisfied." And at page 67, he characterises me as a "disappointed" man, indulging in "excited, and often unjustifiable, expressions."

These are tolerably strong expressions and imputations for one officer of the E. I. Company to apply to another, who, in his own humbler sphere, is, equally with Mr. Reid himself, in the enjoyment of "a reputation which is founded on two and thirty years of laborious, successful, and unblemished public usefulness." But, though the expressions are strong, Mr. Reid is quite prepared to justify them. And he *does* justify them. His justification, however, is *sui generis*. It consists, not in proving their propriety, but in maintaining their expediency:—not in showing that they are true, or applicable, or generous, or gentlemanly, but in explaining *why* they have been employed. Thus at page 66 he intimates that in his "Answer" to "Indus," he was—

> "Compelled, in his own vindication, not only to expose the malice of his assailant, but to go further, and point out where Colonel Outram and other

* Italicised in the original.

parties, whose statements and opinions (however perverted) have been made the groundwork of attack, are wrong in their facts, and mistaken in their conclusions; *and as far as lies in his power* TO ACCOUNT FOR, *and* EXPLAIN THE CAUSES *of their errors. In this process a reference to* PERSONAL CHARACTER, *and* FEELINGS *is* * * * *unavoidable.*"

Mr. Reid, however, confidently hopes that in giving effect to this peculiar "process" of rebutting an antagonist,—(which consists in meeting the specific charges, based on specific *facts*, preferred against himself by one man, by allegations regarding, not the public acts only, but the moral character and inner life of another, who has already had the misfortune to have his statements and opinions "perverted,")—he has "in no instance carried it beyond legitimate bounds." Perhaps not. In politics legitimacy is very variously defined. In polemics, possibly, a still greater latitude of opinion may prevail respecting its elements and limits. And Mr. Reid must be allowed to be a competent judge of the mode of controversy and style of language best suited to the exigencies of his own case. But he can hardly expect that I shall kiss the hand that unjustly smites me.

Had he possessed any grounds for suspecting that I was the author or inspirer of the original "Chapters" which evoked his "Letter," or that I was in any way connected with what he terms the "greater scurrility and falsehood" of the Pamphlet in which they were reproduced, his attacks on me would not have been one whit more relevant to his own vindication, than they are at present. But they would at least have had the plea of vengeance to palliate them; and I might have hesitated to return his fire, though conscious that I had done nothing to provoke it. Not only, however, does he not venture to insinuate that I had any connection or complicity with his assailant, but he very unnecessarily takes the trouble of vindicating me from the suspicion of such complicity; a suspicion which never could have entered the mind of any one, who had not read Mr. Reid's Pamphlet, and seen how constantly he brings my name into contact with that of "Indus." At page 66 he adduces certain circumstances, which, in his opinion, incontestibly prove

that I "could have been no party to the disgraceful attack." This is kind—but superogatory. For even if misled by the manner in which Mr. Reid makes use of my name, some stray recipient of his Pamphlet had, for a few minutes, suspected me of complicity with "Indus," the suspicion must have vanished, when, in the progress of his researches, he discovered the "inaccuracies," of which, Mr. Reid makes much use,—not, I would fain believe, for the purpose, but certainly with the effect, of diverting the reader's attention from the real questions at issue.* These inaccuracies, (such as they are, and most of them are not very important,) clearly prove that the writer of the "Chapters" had never been in the Bombay Presidency; and that in their preparation he had not taken counsel with any one conversant with the local politics of that dependency. Lest, however, it should occur to Mr. Reid in his "process" of "accounting for, and explaining the causes of errors," and in the "unavoidable reference to personal character and feelings" which that process involves, that I may possibly be suspected by others, of having suggested to the author of the "Chapters" the introduction of a few inaccuracies, with a view to conceal my complicity with that able writer:—and lest he should deem it necessary, in a second edition of his Pamphlet, to vindicate me from this suppositious suspicion, I beg to assure him, on the honor of an officer and a gentlemen, that I am not "Indus;" that I have not the pleasure of being acquainted with him; that I knew not who

---

* It is a pity that Mr. Reid, in replying to the allegations of "Indus," should have thought it necessary to draw an *ex uno disce omnes* sort of argument, the unsatisfactory nature of which must be obvious to all, from unimportant errors, which, though they appeared in the original newspaper articles, did not occur in the Pamphlet he professed to answer. The second, and still further amended edition of that Pamphlet was published on the 14th of February; Mr. Reid's Letter not till the 2nd of March. Yet Mr. Reid saw fit to criticise only the original "Chapters," dating his criticism on the 10th of February; and, in a dateless postscript, simply acknowledging that he had seen the corrected and amplified Pamphlet edition after having written—he does not say after having *printed*—his remarks.

the author of the "Chapters" was, till after *the whole* of them had appeared in the "Daily News;" that till they appeared, I had no cognizance or foreknowledge of them whatever; and that when they did appear, they were as much a matter of surprise to myself, as they could possibly have been to Mr. Reid;—inasmuch as, till they did appear, I feared that the peculiar malarrangement of the Blue Books, (which even Mr. Reid cannot affect to believe was designed to injure him or to favor me,) had effectually deterred the English journalists from attempting to grapple with the subject of Baroda and Bombay corruption.

I make these declarations, because, however little I may relish being assailed by Mr. Reid, I experience less inconvenience, and am likely to sustain less injury from his assaults than from the vindications he sets up in my behalf. These, certainly, are not numerous, but they are extremely disagreeable, and, what is worse, they are inconsistent with the facts of the case. Thus, to prove "incontestibly" that I could have been no party to the attack made on him by "Indus," he declares that I "disavowed, in every page of the Blue Book, all belief that his *character* for purity was in any degree compromised, though anxious to prove that his name had been scandalously prostituted by a wicked party." If by "character," Mr. Reid means, as the context implies, *reputation*, I beg, most emphatically, to deny an impeachment, the admission of which would stultify those labours which, detrimental as they have proved to my own personal prospects, have resulted in advancing the public interests. I never made any such disavowal as is attributed to me by Mr. Reid. On the contrary, the burden of my reports to the Bombay Government was, that the name of Mr. Reid had come to be associated in the public mind "with the foulest of deeds and the vilest of men." I detailed several of the facts and coincidences on which the natives of Baroda justified their belief that Mr. Reid was himself corrupt, and the patron of the corrupt; and I showed that this was of so startling a character as to render it the solemn and bounden duty of the Government to institute a stern and rigorous inquiry into the subject.

I did not myself believe Mr. Reid to be corrupt. If I had, I should have adopted a very different mode of procedure from that which I pursued: some mode of procedure which would have forced inquiry, and have superseded the necessity of making those earnest appeals and remonstrances, which ended in my being driven from office, after having been compelled to record against myself censures and condemnations which my honorable masters have pronounced to be unjust. I knew Mr. Reid; I respected his talents; I, moreover, regarded him as a man of incorruptible integrity; and—though I considered him not devoid of the *esprit du corps* of his service, nor free from prejudice, nor inaccessible to certain weaknesses and bureautic maxims which in India, as in England, occasionally operate on men in office—I could as soon have believed him capable of cannibalism as of bribe-taking. But I felt that, (to quote the words in which Mr. W. E. Frere subsequently endeavoured to impress views similar to my own on the authorities), "though the integrity of the members of the Bombay Government is not to be doubted, yet, if the belief exists that they are accessible to corruption, the evil is almost as great as if the Government was corrupt, and too strong measures could not be adopted to remove that idea." Confident in the purity, not only of Mr. Reid, but of his colleagues and successors, I believed that the further inquiry was pushed, the more completely would his character be rescued from the unhappy association into which it had fallen. And I never doubted but that we should obtain a solution of the apparently strong evidence to his prejudice, which should not only exonerate him, but enable us to bring to justice all the principal actors in that deep and widely ramifying scheme of corruption and treachery, by which the character of the Bombay Government had been brought so low in native estimation. The Government, however, took a different view of the matter. They were very indignant at my placing on record the facts which had tended to the prejudice of Mr. Reid's character, and for insisting on the obvious conclusions to which those facts must lead in the minds of all who were not, like them and myself, well assured of Mr.

Reid's integrity. But they did not afford me the aid and countenance I required, for removing these conclusions by effecting a satisfactory solution of the facts on which they rested.

How calculated the proceedings of Mr. Reid's successors were, to satisfy the natives that my investigations were viewed with disfavour by the Government, simply because their tendency was towards a solution of matters different from that which I anticipated, and prejudicial to Mr. Reid, shall hereafter be shown. It will then be seen that while I *did* persist in asserting my belief of Mr. Reid's integrity, I did *not* hesitate to say, not only that his reputation was damaged, but—as regarded the native mind—most seriously damaged. And it will further be seen, that Mr. Reid, in his zeal for the honour of a convicted criminal, has deliberately rejected the argument on which I based my assertions that a strict inquiry would result in disconnecting his name from the intrigues with which it had become associated in the popular mind.

There is yet one subject to which I would fain advert before closing this chapter. Mr. Reid distinctly states, at page 14 of his Pamphlet, that of "*all the rumours to his prejudice in Baroda,*"—"*not one was known to him until,* AFTER THE PUBLICATION OF THE CHAPTERS, *he read them in the Blue Book!*"

Of course I do not for a moment presume to doubt Mr. Reid's word. I accept his statement. But, in accepting, I must comment on it. For it immediately follows the complaint that not one of these "rumours," were noticed by me till after Mr. Reid had left India.

The *rumours* (and *facts*) regarding Mr. Reid, detailed in my reports, are mainly in reference to events which had occurred during my absence in Egypt, from November 1848, till February 1850. I did not resume my duties at Baroda till May in the latter year. And it can hardly be a matter of accusation,—and ought not to be one of insinuation—against me, that I did not report these "*rumours*" (and *facts*) till after the departure of Mr. Reid from India, which (at page 6) he informs us took place on the 3rd of March, 1849?

I was not honoured with being on the list of Mr. Reid's correspondents. Duty did not require, and good taste forbade, that I should open a correspondence with him in order to apprize him of the rumours and facts to his prejudice, of which I was labouring to effect a solution compatible with his honor. But amongst the members and secretaries of Government, Mr. Reid had many friends. All in fact were his friends; some I *know* to have been his correspondents. And unless Mr. Reid had thus solemnly pledged his word of honor as a gentleman, that not one of these correspondents had ever suffered any precise allusion to my labours at Baroda to escape their pens, I should have regarded the circumstance as utterly incredible. As it is, I can only assume that if they had thought Mr. Reid's interests were to be subserved by making any such communication—and in writing to a retired Councillor there would have been no official impropriety—they would have made it. At all events, on them, not on me, must rest the blame.

Again, Mr. Reid informs us (at page 61), that during his absence from India, a strong and violent party had been casting slurs on his character, through the local press. Surely these newspaper articles must have excited his attention, and awakened his curiosity, when reinforced by the declaration which he admits having received from myself, "on my return to England" in April 1852,—that he "ought to be thankful to me for bringing to justice the scoundrels who had made so infamous an use of his name." Not only would most men feel desirous in such a case to ascertain some particulars on the subject, but there were especial reasons why Mr. Reid should have been more than usually solicitous on that head. For he was a candidate for the East Indian Direction; and it behoved him to be in a position to explain the real facts of his case to such of his constituents as might have chanced to hear his name "infamously used," even at second hand. Had he desired to see them, Mr. Reid's position at the India House would have secured for him a perusal of my manuscript reports, immediately on their arrival. But he practically pledges his honour, not only that he never took the trouble of

asking for them, but he did not deem the Blue Books worthy of examination till (two months after their publication) an Analysis of them was given in a London newspaper. It is a curious fact, and worthy of being noted, as evincing in a striking manner Mr. Reid's superiority to a species of sensitiveness which even greater men have not been ashamed to avow. And it is the more curious and noteworthy, inasmuch as *I know*, that long prior to the appearance of the "Chapters," Mr. Reid was informed, by at least one gentleman, of whom he will not feel inclined to speak lightly, that my reports contained matter of which it was absolutely necessary he should be able to give a satisfactory explanation. At all events, it is hardly generous, and barely equitable, in one who has displayed so little curiosity regarding "*rumours*" which he had been told deeply concerned his honour, to imply a charge of unfairness against me, on the ground that I did not communicate to Government, prior to March 1849, information affecting himself, which I did not receive till after May 1850.

CHAPTER II.

MR. REID'S FAITH AS IT IS IN NURSOO PUNT.

In refuting the accusations and insinuations levelled at me by Mr. Reid, I shall take the liberty of discussing them in the order of their importance, rather than in the sequence, they assume in his own Pamphlet. And as upwards of three-fourths of Mr. Reid's *brochure* (with the animadversions on myself therein contained,) hinge on a difference of opinion between that gentleman and the public at large, respecting the character of a dismissed public servant, named Nursoo Punt, that individual appears to me to possess undoubted claims to a priority of notice. His latter history is painfully instructive; and it shall form the subject of future chapters. In the present one, I shall limit myself to an exposition of the discrepancies of opinion regarding his character which exist between Mr. Reid and those who have qualified themselves to form an opinion on the subject.

I have already stated that the Bombay Government failed to afford me the aid and countenance I required in the conduct of investigations designed to vindicate their own and Mr. Reid's integrity. In justice to an esteemed and honoured friend, I am bound to state that one of their number—Mr. J. P. Willoughby—invariably expressed himself in favour of full and unrestricted enquiry, and applauded the objects I had in view. But a different policy prevailed. The proceedings of his colleagues tended to rivet more powerfully than ever, in the native community of Baroda, the belief that certain influential and wealthy criminals, whose evil deeds it was my duty, at that time, as Resi-

dent, to investigate, enjoyed the secret favour, sympathy, and support of those in power. And my difficulties were, of course, immeasurably enhanced by the prevalence of this belief. The evil-doers were emboldened; their agents acquired increased audacity; men who at one time had hesitated to become their allies, no longer objected to perjure themselves in a cause which was supposed to be backed by an authority higher than my own; and the witnesses through whose aid, alone, I could hope to arrive at the truth, shrunk from giving testimony which would assuredly expose them to the vengeance of the local magnates, and might, they feared, entail on them the displeasure of government.

Conspicuous amongst the offenders who profited by this state of matters, were Baba Nafra and Nursoo Punt: the former the spoliator of the bank of which he was the appointed guardian, and the foul conspirator against the widow of his benefactor; the latter the corrupt public servant whom I regarded as mainly responsible for the sad circumstance of Mr. Reid's name having "come to be associated with the foulest of deeds and the vilest of men."

Despite, however, the denial to me of that aid which I solicited from Government, I was eventfully enabled to expose the turpitude of both these bad men. On the 31st of March 1851, I forwarded to Bombay an elaborate report on the conspiracies by which Baba Nafra had compassed the ruin of Joitabhae Settanee, (Parliamentary Papers, 560 of 1852, pp. 319—392).* On the 10th of April, I transmitted a "Statement of Facts" relative to Nursoo Punt, in which I detailed several of the circumstances which had led the natives to regard Mr. Reid as the patron of that unfaithful servant. And in paras. 48, 49, and 52, of the latter document, I made the following observations. (B.B. 1064.)

"When due weight is given to the cumulative effect of the various facts

---

* When I have occasion to quote from this "Paper"---consisting of two ponderous volumes---I shall, hereafter, refer to it as the "Baroda Blue Book," or more briefly indicate it by the letters B.B.

recited in the foregoing pages, it will, I think, be conceded by the Right Honourable the Governor in Council, *not only that Nursoo Punt has prostituted the name of Mr. Reid, but that the votaries of* '*Khutput*' (illicit action) *have* PLAUSIBLE ARGUMENTS *wherewith to justify their belief that that gentleman* WAS *improperly connected with Nursoo Punt, or his wealthy relative Baba Nafra.*"

"And when to the facts recited, is added the conduct of Nursoo in the case of Joitabhae Settanee, conduct which shows that my first suspicions were correct, and that, from first to last, he was in collusion with Baba Nafra, I think I have said enough to show that the late native agent has not only forfeited all claims to the consideration of Government on account of former services, but that he has merited the severest punishment in the power of Government to inflict; *and that any* CLEMENCY *shown to him, will be regarded by the natives of Baroda, as* ADDITIONAL AND CONCLUSIVE PROOF THAT THE REPUTATION OF MR. REID, AND OTHERS, IS SO COMPLETELY AT HIS MERCY, THAT HE DOES ENJOY THE IMPUNITY OF WHICH HE WAS WONT TO BOAST." * * *

"For the want of *more* DIRECT and COPIOUS *proofs of the guilt of Nursoo Punt*, I have to plead as my apology, the all but insuperable difficulties I have had to contend with in my investigations. These difficulties arise in part, from the fact that the leading men in the city, and in the durbar, (the sovereign's court) are more or less criminally connected with Baba Nafra, and his kinsman Nursoo Punt; and in part, from the fact that *all* are more or less interested in perpetuating the system of 'Khutput' (illicit action) which it has been the object of my investigations to upset. *But the* PRINCIPAL SOURCE *of the difficulties I have had to overcome, is the conviction deeply rooted in the minds of all, that I am working against the Government,* OR RATHER, THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS WORKING AGAINST ME."

Under the influence of representations which were never justified, (B. B. 1427-28), I was induced to modify "this Statement of Facts," and to erase several of the passages in which I had shown how plausible was the evidence wherewith the natives justified their belief in Mr. Reid's corruption. No sooner had I done so, and thus authorised the Government to submit to the Court of Directors a much weaker case than that originally sent in, than I was ordered to prosecute Nursoo Punt before a legal tribunal, hampered and fettered by "Adawlut" rules and technicalities, on seven distinct charges framed out of my Report. Some of these did not appear to admit of LEGAL proof, though of

their truthfulness no moral doubt could be entertained. The establishment of others, was, to some extent, contingent on true testimony being borne by the dependents of those very men who boasted, and whose assertions were believed when they boasted, that they and the Government were in league to defeat my enquiries. In respect of nearly all the charges, my own testimony was most important; yet by making me act as prosecutor, the Government excluded me from the witness box. And the improbability of my obtaining a verdict against Nursoo Punt was still further increased by certain proceedings on the part of the authorities which are fully detailed in my Khutput Report. (B. B. 1428-1445). These I shall not weary my readers by reciting: but I may be excused for observing, that though the Government saw fit to afford to Nursoo Punt all the advantages derivable from an enquiry conducted on strict "Adawlut" rules—rules of which I was necessarily ignorant, and my ignorance of which led me to play unconsciously into the hands of the defendant—the Commissioner, to whom the investigation was confided, exercised no criminal jurisdiction whatever. He could pass no sentence. He was not even empowered to suggest one. His proceedings constituted a mere *Enquiry*. He had simply to report. And on the Government it devolved to disallow his Report, in whole or in part—a privilege of which they were not slow to avail themselves; and to pass "such orders as might appear just, and consistent with their powers"—a range of action from the first open to them without recourse to the intervention of a Commission.

Despite, however, the disadvantages under which I was placed, and which I believed must necessarily ensure the acquittal of the accused, the prosecution was, on the whole, successful.

Two of the charges involved bribe taking. In reference to one, though the Commissioner could not pronounce Nursoo's guilt to be legally established—"*the case being from the first scarcely susceptible of judicial proof*"—he had "*painful suspicions*" that the defendant HAD, in November 1845, received a bribe of £2000

from Baba Nafra. (B. B. p. 1050). In regard to the other, he recorded that, though full legal proof was wanting, "*the strongest suspicions were left on his mind*" (B. B. p. 1051) that, in October 1848, Nursoo Punt received from the same Baba Nafra, the sum of £2807, being, as the Charge specified, "in part payment of a sum of £7807, promised to be paid to Nursoo Punt by Baba Nafra, for the exercise of his influence in Baba Nafra's favour, in the enquiry respecting the alleged abduction of the child Joitabhae Settanee."* In respect of the third charge, Nursoo Punt was found guilty, to the extent of having endeavoured to mislead me, to the advantage of Baba Nafra, and to the detriment of this very Joitabhae Settanee.† A fourth charge was, that he had, in 1848, allowed a false claim to the extent of nearly £30,000, set up by Baba Nafra, to be pro-

---

* In respect of these bribery charges the Court of Directors intimate that they "entirely agree" with Mr. Frere's opinion that "*the strongest suspi-*
"*cion rests on him in respect to both.*"---B. B. p. 18.

† B. B., p. 1011-1050, Mr. Frere was compelled to acquit Nursoo Punt of having deceived Captain French, (who officiated during my absence in Egypt from November 1848, to April 1850,) to the detriment of Joitabhae, that officer having taken on himself the entire responsibility. "But," observe the Honourable the Court of Directors, "it is certain that Capt. French
"did not obtain an accurate knowledge of the facts of the case, and that,
"consequently, he misled the Government, and enabled the persecutors of
"Joitabhae to commit gross injustice. And if his assumption of the whole
"responsibility could be held to acquit Nursoo Punt, it must do so by throw-
"ing the whole weight of the blame on Capt. French. *It is, however, evident*
"*that having only just arrived at Baroda, Capt. French was in a great measure*
"*dependent for his information and impressions on others,* AND PARTICULARLY
"ON HIS NATIVE AGENT. *And even on the supposition that Capt. French,*
"*acting on his own judgment, adopted a wrong view of important matters of*
"*fact,* IT WAS THE DUTY OF NURSOO, *himself perfectly acquainted with the*
"*case,* TO REPRESENT THE TRUE STATE OF IT TO HIS SUPERIOR. *Instead of*
"*doing this, there is ample ground of moral conviction, that* HE MISINFORMED
"CAPT. FRENCH, *as he has been clearly proved to have misinformed Lieut.-*
"*Col. Outram.*"---B. B. p. 18.

secuted in my office without expressing to me the slightest doubt of the justice of the said claim, though he knew it to be unjust: and that he culpably withheld from my notice, documents in his custody, which proved the injustice of a considerable portion of the amount claimed. On this charge Nursoo was found guilty, notwithstanding that Mr. Reid had, in December 1848, in an elaborate vindication, acquitted him even of negligence,—declared it to be unnecessary to ask explanations "on a single point" connected with the case,—and severely censured myself for presuming to cast reflections on so immaculate a public servant. In this conviction the Court of Directors fully concurred. In regard to a fifth charge it was determined that the conduct of Nursoo, as regarded one of my predecessors, "appeared in a very unfavorable light;" and that, as regarded myself he had been "negligent"—the charge even of "negligence" having been indignantly repudiated by Mr. Reid in 1848, as utterly devoid of foundation.* The sixth charge was to the effect, that, in September 1847,† Nursoo Punt instigated Baba Nafra to depute an agent to Bombay to bribe Mr. Reid; and the Commissioner determined that Baba Nafra "*did* depute "a person to Bombay, who spent large sums ostensibly for pur- "poses of corruption, AND THAT NURSOO PUNT WAS AWARE OF THE "PERSON BEING SO DEPUTED, AND CONNIVED AT IT: *but that it is not* "*proved that he* INSTIGATED *Baba Nafra to depute the man, or that* "*he was deputed with the* SPECIFIC *object of bribing Mr. Reid.*"‡

---

* B.B. p. 1050. The Honourable Court decided that in this case "*very* "*strong suspicions rest on him.*"---B.B. p. 18

† In framing my charges, I gave the year 1848 as the date: the mistake occurred in consequence of my ignorance of the fact, that the local commercial differed from the ordinary year, as given in the Hindoo calendar. The Commissioner was, I believe, at first, as much puzzled as myself.

‡ The Court of Directors agree in the opinion expressed by the Bombay Government, that "even this degree of criminality was not proved against "Nursoo Punt, *though very strong suspicions rest on him* with regard to the "mission in question;" as well as in regard to the third Charge, that of withholding information in the case of Gorajee Pol. B.B. p. 18.

I may add, however, that the Blue Book contains evidence that a portion of the money "spent ostensibly for purposes of corruption," was *intended* by Baba Nafra's agent to reach the hands of Mr. Reid. Of the seventh charge, which attributed to Nursoo Punt the "making an improper and unauthorised use of Mr. Reid's name, he was found guilty. It was established to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, that, on at least two occasions, once in November 1848, (while the cases in respect of which Mr. Reid wrote his vindication of Nursoo were before Government,) and again, in January 1849, when the decision of Government (based on that vindication) reached Baroda, Nursoo Punt "made an improper use of Mr. Reid's name;" and Mr. Frere further determined, that, "about the same time, with a view to the "further promulgation of his boast,* he had a copy of a letter "he had received from Bombay, purporting to come under in- "structions from Mr. Reid, made by Muncherjee Nusserwanjee, "an intimate friend of his rival, Baba Fudky;—and that Nursoo "Punt had not attempted to show that he was in any way "authorised to make this use of Mr. Reid's name." †

It can hardly be a matter of surprise that Mr. Reid should be annoyed, to find a patient judicial enquiry, extending over several months, and under the conduct of a judge selected by the Government itself, had resulted in proving the untenability of the defence of Nursoo which he himself penned in 1848. But, as that result has been attained; as the point has been conceded even by the Bombay Government; and as it has been made a special subject of reproachful comment by the Court of Directors, (B. B. p. 18;) it does seem strange that Mr. Reid should evince such continued regard for a convicted culprit,

---

* That he enjoyed the "*secret friendship*" of Mr. Reid.

† In respect of this charge the Court of Directors acquiesce in the judgment given by Mr. Frere; "but" they observe, "it is not shown that he did more than boast in general terms of the protection of Mr. Reid." These general terms, however, as will be seen, were all in reference to specific cases in which he vaunted (with many plausible arguments in support of the vaunt) that the protection of Mr. Reid secured impunity to himself and his corrupt and wealthy relative, Baba Nafra.

who, as I more than once reported to Government, in despatches which Mr. Reid has himself perused, encouraged the belief that he, and his relative Baba Nafra, held the reputation of Mr. Reid and others at their mercy. And this tenderness to the individual through whom his name has come to be associated with "the foulest of deeds, and the vilest of men," is the more remarkable, inasmuch as it was on the strength of my conviction of Nursoo's falsehood and treachery, that I continued, in my official reports, to reiterate my belief, that a full enquiry would establish Mr. Reid's freedom from corrupt practices.

This, however, is a matter in which Mr. Reid has an undoubted right to judge for himself. And if he had limited himself to the expression of the opinion *implied* at page 65 of his pamphlet, to the effect, that the "matters" affecting Nursoo are "still involved in a deep shade of darkness and doubt," I should have left him in undisputed possession of a dogma which I feel assured he will find few readers of the Blue Books ready to embrace. I should have been content to marvel, in silence, at the displeasure he evinces when his critic "Indus" applies to Nursoo the epithet "miscreant." But Mr. Reid has overstepped these limits. The whole of his allegations (attack on myself)—co-extensive nearly with his attempts to answer the accusations of "Indus"—*hinge on the assumed innocence of Nursoo.* Writing in February, 1853, he persists in pronouncing me guilty of injustice to that corrupt servant, because in 1848 I preferred against him, in a mild and modified form, a charge of which (clothed in stronger terms) he was formally convicted in 1851. He deliberately reproduces the censures and insinuations against myself contained in his original and *now* judicially refuted defence of that bad man. He accuses me of having in my reports evinced "unfairness," "tortuosity," and other base qualities, with the view of damaging his own character, while invoking punishment on the corrupt servant, who had boasted (falsely as I believed) of a "secret friendship" with Mr. Reid. He denies that I was justified in reporting that his character stood in need of that vindication which could only come of stern and searching enquiry. And he couples this denial with the grossest imputations in respect

of the motives which influenced me to make these reports. I am, therefore, compelled—unwillingly, and with pain, but unavoidably—to enter at considerable length into the history of Nursoo Punt, and to detail some of the very plausible grounds on which, as I repeatedly informed Government, the natives justified their belief that in Mr. Reid both he and Baba Nafra had a friend and ally—bound to their interests not only by ties of "secret friendship," but by the knowledge that his character was completely at their mercy. Nay more; I must avail myself of information which I did not possess when my reports were written, but which has since been made public property by the authority of Parliament, and which shows, not only that my reports were devoid of exaggeration, but that the belief in Mr. Reid's corruptibility was based on still more plausible arguments than those of which I was cognizant. For the peculiar style of controversy adopted by Mr. Reid, justifies the suspicion that he would not hesitate to indulge in fresh and equally baseless and ungenerous attacks on me, if from a misplaced delicacy, I were, on the present occasion, to leave unexposed and unrefuted, any considerable number of the fallacious and contradictory statements with which his pamphlet abounds.

In the prosecution of the disagreeable task which Mr. Reid has so unnecessarily imposed on me, I shall endeavour to avoid aught that even he himself could consider unfair. And with this view I shall confine myself as far as possible to a chronological treatment of my materials. By the adoption of this plan I shall be compelled to be more prolix than I should wish,—and to give fuller details and comments in the earlier portions of my narrative, than would be necessary under a different treatment of my subject: but the reader may rest assured that though at times he may consider me diffuse, and unnecessarily minute, he will eventually discover that I advance nothing which is not more or less necessary for a satisfactory elucidation of those melancholy scandals of which so ample a share has fallen to the lot of Mr. Reid, and to demonstrate the utter falsity of the arguments by which that gentleman endeavours to prove that his protegé, Nursoo Punt, was in no wise responsible for the prevalence of those scandals.

CHAPTER III.

THE HISTORY OF NURSOO PUNT, IN RELATION TO MR. REID.

The office establishment of the Baroda Resident consists of two departments—the European, and the Native. And at the head of the latter is an officer, who, under the designation of "Native Agent," is invested with the functions and responsibilities of confidential native assistant to the Resident. In 1843, a vacancy occurred in this appointment; the last incumbent having been, like several of his predecessors, dismissed for corrupt practices. And amongst the candidates for the post was Nursoo Punt, at that date Dufturdar in the office of the Revenue Commissioner at Poonah, in which capacity he had served for many years, and achieved, as Mr. Reid tells us (page 23), "the high and honourable reputation of being the most distinguished native revenue servant the Bombay Presidency has produced."

As Dufturdar, Nursoo Punt enjoyed an income of £480 per annum in the salubrious climate of the Deccan. The salary of the situation for which he applied, was only £360 per annum; and the scene of its duties was proverbially one of the most unhealthy stations in Western India. But it was a notorious fact that, for a series of years, the native agents at Baroda had amassed enormous wealth by betraying the confidence of their superiors, and by engaging in and promoting the foulest corruption. This source of illegitimate income was still unexhausted; and Nursoo enjoyed facilities for turning it to account equal to those possessed by the most fortunate of his predecessors. For he was related by family ties to several of the more eminent of the Baroda corruptionists.

These relationships, indeed, were not known to his European superiors at the date of his application. But the mere fact of his applying for an office in all respects less desirable, for an honest man, than that of which he was in possession, was well calculated to excite their suspicions. Nursoo accordingly thought it necessary to offer a solution of the suspicious fact, which he endeavoured to render less suggestive of suspicion, by going through the farce of requesting that the salary of the office to which he aspired might be raised to an equality with that he proposed to relinquish. The request he knew to be inadmissible; and his explanation he must have felt to be unsatisfactory. It was (Mr. Reid tells us at page 24) that his health had been undermined by his "wandering mode of life"—which consisted in annual jaunts in the suite of the Revenue Commissioner; and that he desired to enjoy "ease and quiet in his native country of Guzerat!"* The view taken of his application, and of the cogency of the reasons on which it was based, is now no longer dubious. Even Mr. Reid admits that HE, and "MANY OTHERS," "*warned Nursoo of the danger of taking* "*service in a place which was known to be so vile a sink of cor-* "*ruption as Baroda; and pointed out to him that he would incur* "THE RISK EITHER OF BEING HIMSELF CONTAMINATED BY A residence "in such a nest of villainy, or of losing his present well-earned "reputation, though he might be as virtuous as an angel."

The remonstrances and cautions of his European friends failed to influence Nursoo. He persisted in his application. And this *facile princeps* of native revenue servants, the respected of many Revenue Commissioners, and of Mr. Reid, the Revenue Secretary, was, in December 1842, unfortunately for himself, and unhappily for others, permitted to leave the department in which he had earned such distinction, and to proceed on a reduced

---

* When, in 1851, Nursoo Punt was ordered to proceed from Ahmedubad (his native city) to Baroda (from which he had been removed about a year before) to stand his trial on charges of corruption, he addressed a piteous petition to Government, in which he described himself as "A STRANGER IN A STRANGE LAND!" B.B. p. 1000.

income to the unhealthy climate of Baroda, that late in life he might enter on his noviciate in a widely different department; one in which there was a risk, obvious even to his friends, of his becoming corrupt; and in which, though his friends were not then aware of it, he had more than ordinary temptations and facilities for prostituting his functions, and betraying his trust!

He had not long been settled in his new appointment, ere a petition was sent to government, accusing him of having accepted bribes, eleven years before, when visiting Baroda, in the suite of Lord Clare. The petition further intimated that Nursoo was related by family ties to more than one of his predecessors, who had been dismissed for corrupt practices, as well as to the notorious Baba Nafra, who had, on former occasions, been denounced by the local officers, for his systematic corruption of government servants, and who was specially prohibited, by Sir G. Arthur, from access to the Baroda Residency, on account of his complicity with the attempt made in 1840, to bribe the government of Sir J. Carnac.*

The petition was received in March 1844. In April it was sent to Mr. Remington, the officiating Resident, to have its allegations investigated: and on the 1st of May that gentleman reported that Nursoo *was* related by family ties to the corruptionists named. As regarded the bribe taking, he observed, that as no complaints had been previously made on the subject, it was "rather too late in the day to commence them now."

Mr. Reid tells us that though he was in council when the petition was received, "it certainly made no impression on his memory." And, though he does not state, he implies, that equally unproductive of "impression on his memory," was the official report made by Mr. Remington, that this same Nursoo, whom he had so strongly dissuaded from going to Baroda, and whose

---

* The papers relating to this—the Dhakjie Dadajee—intrigue, have been ordered by the House of Commons, on the motion of Mr. Otway, M.P. for Stafford.

application to be sent thither, was itself so suggestive of suspicion, was allied by ties of caste and kin, to dismissed and degraded corruptionists, and to a man who had been an accomplice of the Guicowar in the design entertained by that Prince to administer to Mr. Reid himself, a bribe of £6,000. It is the more remarkable, that Mr. Remington's report should have left no impression on Mr. Reid's memory, inasmuch as he himself signed a "minute," in which, in common with Sir G. Arthur and Mr. J. H. Crawford, he distinctly implied, that had the Government received timely notice of Nursoo's relationship to the leading Baroda corruptionists, they would not have sanctioned his appointment. This "minute" was written on the 24th of May 1844, barely six months after Mr. Reid had addressed his dissuasions to Nursoo. (P. 946, No. 7.)

Such were some of the antecedents of the individual, whom, on my assumption of office as Resident, in May 1847, after nearly ten years absence from Guzerat, I found in the post of native agent at Baroda. But I was wholly ignorant of them. I had never heard a word whispered to the man's disadvantage. His quiet and unobtrusive manner impressed me strongly in his favor. His industry, his intimate knowledge of all that pertained to his office, the care and regularity with which he kept the records, and the familiarity with the most trivial of them which he displayed, attracted my attention, and commanded my admiration; and I regarded him as an invaluable public servant, not less trustworthy than useful.

As time wore on, however, I had occasion to doubt his honesty. I discovered him endeavouring to prejudice me against the widow Joitabhae, by a representation which I had good reason to believe untrue. Other little traits of disingenuousness were, from time to time, displayed; and at length, in the summer of 1848, though I still remained ignorant of his family connection with Baba Nafra—of his pecuniary transactions with that individual, as subsequently elicited—and of his having "connived" at the mission of the bribemaster whom Baba Nafra sent to Bombay in the previous September—I was reluctantly compelled to suspect

him of infidelity, in consequence of his conduct in two cases, in one of which the Baba's interests were directly and deeply concerned. These were the cases of two Mahratta chiefs, named Gorajee Pol and Govind Row Guicowar. The former case displayed a conspiracy to defraud the Pol, on the part of the agent to whom the management of his estates had been confided by a previous Resident. In the latter, a false claim, to the extent of nearly £30,000, supported by the fraudulent substitution of a cancelled for a valid bond, had been preferred by Baba Nafra, the sole manager of the Baroda banking house of Hurree Bhugtee. Both, but more especially the former, were cases involving very intricate details, which none but a native, skilled in native finance questions, was competent thoroughly to unravel. I accordingly called in the aid of my native agent. I soon, however, had reason to suspect that he was resolved, not only not to render me honest and cordial assistance, but to embarrass my enquiries and conceal the truth from me. It therefore became necessary to invoke other aid. I applied to an individual named Fudkey, who had in 1837-38 rendered valuable services to Mr. Malet and myself in bringing to light the corrupt practices of those days. His assistance was obtained, and those frauds and conspiracies were exposed, in the investigation of which, as Mr. Frere has since judicially determined, Nursoo had failed to render me the assistance he was competent, and in duty bound, to afford; in the one case, through "negligence;" in the other, through corrupt collusion, and by the wilful suppression of documents in his possession.

About the period when my first suspicions were awakened, Nursoo Punt intimated to me his desire to resign the service; and ere long, he requested me to forward his resignation, and with it a request that he might not only receive the Government pension to which his length of service entitled him; but an equivalent for the extra allowances which he could have claimed had "Warden's Official Fund" not been abolished. I agreed to do so. For I recollected more than one instance of a native servant, who had for long maintained an unblemished reputation falling before the temptations which beset him on his transference to the political department; I knew Baroda to be such a sink

of iniquity, that few natives could long breathe its atmosphere and remain pure; and my compassion far outweighed my indignation. I could not, indeed, have submitted to Nursoo remaining longer as my native agent. It was due to myself, and to those interests of which I was the guardian, to rid my office of his presence; and had he wished to retain his appointment, I must have sent in and supported, specific charges against him. But as he had tendered his resignation, and as he had undoubtedly rendered long and eminent services to the state, it did not appear to me a case which demanded severity; and on the 9th of September, 1848, I forwarded his application, with the usual routine "recommendation," to be disposed of by Government as they should see fit, after taking into consideration the unfavourable reports which I had deemed it my duty to make.*

These reports I could not have avoided making had I felt inclined to do so. For in handing up the cases of Govind Row and Gorajee Pol, dated respectively the 21st August and 7th September, 1848, it was necessary that I should explain why I had been compelled to call in other native aid than that of Nursoo. This, however, I did in no hostile or vindictive spirit. In respect of the first of the two cases, I observed, that Nursoo Punt had "neglected to point out to me causes of suspicion which he now "acknowledges to exist, and others I have indicated, which, "although he does not admit, could scarcely otherwise than have "occurred to so shrewd a native as he is." And in reference to the second case, I mentioned with "regret," that "my native "agent, instead of exerting himself to arrest the evil which he "must have known was going on, has not aided me to the extent "that he ought to have done, in bringing the real state of Gorajee "Pol's affairs to light. Whether caused by apathy and most "blameable carelessness, or culpable collusion with the Paruck, "in the fraud the latter had been carrying on, I am unable to

* And I had the less reason to object, inasmuch as, in his application, he alluded to the facts of his having "*some time back*" intimated, both to the Government and myself, his intention of retiring on his pension, on the very day on which he should have completed the prescribed service of thirty years —that is, on the 11th September 1848—two days after I forwarded his application.

"say, and must leave Government to form their own judgment "on the evidence I have submitted. *But in this case, as in that "which I had reported on the 31st ultimo, I venture to express "my hope, that, in consideration of his long services, the most "lenient view the circumstances admit will be taken of the native "agent's conduct.*"

Yet Mr. Reid, writing in February 1853, with the Blue Books before him, and aware of the results arrived at by Mr. Frere, the Baroda Commissioner, in October 1851—of the admissions of Nursoo's guilt, made by the Bombay Government themselves—and of the still stronger opinions on the subject expressed by the Court of Directors—endeavours to enlist sympathy in behalf of a convicted criminal, by insinuating that I had no definite ground of complaint to prefer against Nursoo, and that I merely wanted to drive him from office, in order that I might bestow his situation on another. Such are the more than insinuations in which Mr. Reid indulges at page 22. And he cites (strangely enough) page 1056 of the Blue Book, in support of the insinuation.*

---

* *Mr. Reid's imputations, at page 22 of his Pamphlet.*

"When, on the 9th September 1848, Col. Outram forwarded Nursoo's application for permission to retire, and, in consideration of his eminent services, for some pension beyond what the ordinary rules awarded to him, he did so with his 'recommendation.' Not a word was then said about suspicion; not a word of warning to the Government not to decide on the request for extra pension till the case of the Pol had been disposed of. It is clear that at that time Col. Outram had no very strong opinion of Nursoo Punt's guilt. *He brought against him no distinct charge of criminality; and admits that all he desired was to get rid of him from his office---this, no doubt, was all that his protegé, Fudky, cared for also.*"—Mr. Reid's "Letter," p. 22.

The passage in the Blue Book which Mr. Reid marginally cites as justifying his imputations.

"In handing up my reports of these cases to Government (dated 31st August, and 7th September, 1848), it became my duty to notice those traits in the conduct of Nursoo Punt which had compelled me to seek assistance from the Fudky. *But as Nursoo Punt had served for 30 years, and was, in respect of that service, entitled to a pension, I did not seek to press hardly on him.* WHAT THE INTERESTS OF MY OFFICE DEMANDED, *was, that I should be relieved of his presence*; AND AS HE HAD ALREADY APPLIED FOR PERMISSION TO RETIRE ON HIS PENSION, I was in hopes that this object would be speedily effected. I, THEREFORE, recommended no punitive measures; *and even conceded that what I believed to be the result of dishonesty might possibly be only chargeable to neglect.*"—Baroda Blue Book, p. 1056.

Hardly more fair, and somewhat inconsistent with this and other charges which he elsewhere makes, is the taunt which he flings at me, in page 21, where he says:—

"His (Colonel Outram's) letters contain no allusion to the fact, since so prominently adduced, of Nursoo Punt's family connexion with Baba Nafra, the manager of Hurree Bhugtee's bank, and others at Baroda; of which, indeed, he tells us, he was not cognizant till the middle of October 1850. It is somewhat strange that though Col. Outram was Resident from May 1847, he had not, till nearly three and a half years subsequently, ascertained that there was any connection between his native agent and any parties at Baroda, although a former Resident, in reporting to government on the anonymous petition of March 1844, to which so much importance has since been attached, had stated the full particulars of such a connection."

It may possibly occur even to less able and clear headed readers than Mr. Reid, that had I been, as he insinuates in more than one place, a tool in the hands of Nursoo Punt's rival; and, as he more than insinuates at page 34, "prejudiced against Nursoo"—unreasonably "suspicious" of him—"credulous,"—and easily "worked upon,"—I should soon have been made aware of the previous history of the native agent, and might possibly have devoted to a search of the records, for facts damaging to the object of my dislike, a portion of that time which I consecrated, in its integrity, to the more useful, and more legitimate duties of my office—to securing redress for the oppressed, and invoking punishment on the fraudulent.

My two Reports were, as I have already said, dated the 31st August and 7th September, 1848. Mr. Reid lays much stress—with what advantage to himself will speedily appear—on the fact that the latter was not delivered at the Secretariat till the 18th of the month. But as neither he nor Mr. Malet pretends that any delay took place in the transmission of the former, which contained my allegations respecting Nursoo Punt's conduct in the Govind Row case, I may assume that it reached Government about the 4th of September,—several days, that is, prior to the receipt of Nursoo's petition for permission to retire on his pension. Whether it did so or not, is, however, quite immaterial to the real

questions at issue. That on the 18th of September both Reports were before Government even Mr. Reid does not pretend to call in question.

On the 17th of September, I myself reached Bombay *en route* to Egypt, whither I had been ordered to repair for the benefit of my health. And on my arrival at the Presidency I lost no time in urging the speedy consideration of my Reports; in order that before I left India, one, at least, of my suggestions, might be considered by the Government. The suggestion was, that advantage should be taken of the frauds committed by the firm of Hurree Bhugtee (that is, by Baba Nafra, the sole manager) to annul the "guarantee" enjoyed by the house. These "guarantees" are pregnant with embarrassment and mischief. Many of them, and this among the number, are only secured during the good behaviour of the holders. Their annulment, whenever opportunities occurred, had often been enjoined on the local Government by the Court of Directors. The continuance of the guarantee to the firm of Hurree Bhugtee, in spite of its many grievous sins, had tended to injure the Government in the eyes of the natives, by confirming their long-cherished belief that the highest Bombay functionaries had corrupt dealings with this house, and with its unprincipled manager Baba Nafra. And I deemed it, therefore, of paramount importance that the guarantee should be withdrawn, as I had preferred against Baba Nafra the double charge of having attempted extortion to the extent of nearly £30,000, and of having supported this extortion by the fraudulent substitution of one bond for another.

The matters treated of in my reports were intricate; in many respects obscure; and while investigating them I had laboured under serious indisposition. I feared that I might not have stated the cases with sufficient minuteness and lucidity: and I was particularly anxious that the cause of justice should not suffer through the imperfections of my despatches: for in both cases unhappy results were to be apprehended, should the Government display leniency to the guilty parties. I accordingly deemed it my duty to offer such additional information as they might deem necessary;

pledging myself to substantiate all the allegations contained in my Reports. These offers I many times repeated. And I frequently expressed my readiness to postpone my departure until the cases were disposed of, should any further explanations be desired at my hands. As it was, I remained in Bombay from the 17th September till the 3rd of November, ready and anxious to complete what might be deemed defective in my Reports, and to clear up all that might seem obscure. But my offers were not accepted. The only answer I could get was "YOUR REPORTS ARE STILL IN MR. REID'S HANDS." (B.B. 1405.) And, as will be hereafter seen, their long detention in Mr. Reid's hands, forms an important element in the mass of circumstantial evidence, on which the natives of Baroda justified their assertions, that that gentleman maintained a corrupt alliance with Nursoo Punt, and "his wicked and wealthy relative," Baba Nafra.

With singular good taste, a good taste which will be better appreciated as we proceed, Mr. Reid declares, at page 33 of his Pamphlet, that, by making these repeated offers of further information, I "*was practising that very species of Khutput* (*illicit action*) *which I have since been so earnest in denouncing.*" And he informs the reader, that the "proper answer to my representations would have been, that, as I had, doubtless, made the cases as complete as I could, they would be decided on their merits; and that, if further information in regard to any points seemed to Government to be requisite, the acting Resident would be instructed to furnish it."

Such sentiments Mr. Reid would have been ashamed to avow in reference to an officer in the position of Resident, who, having devoted several months to arduous investigations, the results of which deeply affected the interests of British wards, and not very indirectly the honour of his Government, and fearing lest he should have failed to do justice to the subject discussed, had, in his zeal for what he regarded as the cause of justice, made considerable sacrifices rather than leave the country till assured that no further information was required from him. But Mr. Reid escapes this embarrassment. He represents me as having waited

in Bombay, at a time when my health demanded my immediate departure, not from any public or honourable motives, but *from a desire to obtain some decision against that Nursoo Punt, whom he had previously accused me of having endeavoured to drive from office, that I might bestow his post on another!* And he leads his reader to infer that some private squabble, arising out of very unsubstantial and indefinite complaints against that native subordinate, having come before government for final settlement, I sought to obtain undue advantages over the man whom, with a fine perception of propriety and delicacy, he calls my "ANTAGONIST." He cannot, he says, (p. 33)—

"Uphold Colonel Outram's claim to the right of using his personal influence with secretaries and members of government, in any case after he had made his official report on it (a mode of proceeding to which, I observe, he was constantly in the habit of resorting), and especially after he had, as in the present instance, given over his office to his assistant, when proceeding on a very long leave of absence. *Had any English officer, civil or military, been his* ANTAGONIST, *would such a proceeding have been tolerated?* WHY SHOULD IT BE SO WHEN NATIVES, WHO ARE ENTITLED TO AT LEAST EQUAL JUSTICE, ARE CONCERNED?

Mr. Reid's position as a gentleman, forbids the supposition that he could have deliberately intended to make statements and implications which he knew to be, not only not true, but diametrically opposed to the truth. I am, therefore, bound to assume, that, the agitation he experienced on reading the animadversions of "Indus," had not subsided when he penned his thirty-third page; and that it caused him to forget the real facts of the case, and to overlook the documents in the Blue Books which proved his assertions to be erroneous. But as no man is entitled to take advantage of his own wrong—even if it arise from a mere error, the result of agitation—I may be permitted to express a hope, that, should his pamphlet ever reach a second edition, Mr. Reid will purge it of at least *this* inaccuracy. Nursoo Punt had sent in his resignation. I never contemplated the bare possibility of his being (through the persuasive influence of Mr. Reid), invited to recall it, and to remain in the confidential post he had already

betrayed. The only doubt that could have occurred to me was, as to whether he would be allowed to retire on a pension, or be dismissed. I had done my best to promote its solution in the manner most advantageous to Nursoo, by suggesting that conduct which I believed (and which has since been judicially proved) to have arisen from corrupt collusion, might possibly be the result of culpable negligence—an offence which did not justify the refusal of a pension to a servant of thirty years' standing. And my only object in expressing my readiness to substantiate all that I had advanced regarding him in my Report, was to prove how very urgent was the necessity for annulling the bank's "guarantee," by showing that there was reason to fear that Baba Nafra had suceeeded in maintaining that improper influence over the native establishment of the Residency which ten years before he was proved to have established.

At pages 34, 35, and 61, Mr. Reid reiterates the same inaccuracies, either in direct terms, or by implication. And it is peculiarly unfortunate that he has done so. For his statements would, if true, or at all resembling the truth, afford something like a palliation of what otherwise can hardly be palliated.

How long my Reports remained "IN MR. REID'S HANDS," I am not in a position to determine. But I had the assurance of Mr. Secretary Malet, up to the date of my departure for Egypt on the 2nd of November, that they had been in Mr. Reids' possession since my arrival in Bombay on the 17th of September. To that assurance I referred in plain and most explicit terms in more than one of the official reports which I addressed to the Bombay Government. And though Mr. Malet and Lord Falkland have both endeavoured to explain away many of my allegations, neither of them has even hinted that my Reports were *not* in Mr. Reid's hands during, at all events, the six weeks that I remained in Bombay. Mr. Reid, writing in February 1853, and "arguing from dates and official documents," avers that there is some mistake, and professes to prove it. (p. 31.) But he admits, (p. 32,) that his "previous impressions were that the papers had been some time by him." And I shall hereafter show that his "impressions"

were correct, by proving that his "arguing" is fallacious. In this place I shall merely express my regret that, in respect of this, as in respect of the motives to which he attributes my prolonged sojourn in Bombay, his mistakes regarding the real facts of the case should be such as an unscrupulous hired advocate might be supposed willing to hazard in defending him from the charges levelled against him by "*Indus.*"

In illustration of my meaning I may mention, that the day after my arrival in Bombay, Nursoo Punt (still at Baroda,) in violation of official usage, and the rules of the service, forwarded, through MR. REID, a petition to the Bombay Government, in which he expressed the great "mortification" he felt at hearing that I had recently made "two unfavourable reports to Government" respecting him. He represented that I had, for a long time, "had a kind regard towards him," but that, "unfortunately, on the misrepresentation of his enemies, a sudden change took place in my mind." And he begged that he might not be condemned without being heard in his defence.

By sending a petition of any kind, more especially one relating to my official reports, otherwise than through the Resident or his assistant and temporary *locum tenens*, the native agent, a man of thirty years' service, was well aware that he was guilty of an irregularity which, had it been committed by myself, or any other European or native officer, would have drawn down on us a severe censure. The petition, in such a case, would have been returned with orders to "transmit it through the prescribed channel." And if, as in the present instance, the irregularly transmitted petition had reflected on the petitioner's superior, and attributed his official acts to the influence of misrepresentations, made by interested parties, Government would have afforded some manifestations of their displeasure, more emphatic than a mere censure.*

* Mr. Reid himself practically admits, at page 41 of his "Letter," that the petition *was* sent to him, when alluding to a petition from another individual received by Government in November 1848. In that petition it was stated, (and the statement has been judicially confirmed,) that Nursoo

But the petition was *not* returned to Nursoo. It was received on the 22nd of September; and on the 26th it was "circulated" along with his application for pension, which had only the day previous been returned from the office of the "civil auditor," to whom it had been "referred," and who had reported that Nursoo's application for extra pension was "*inadmissible.*" No hint of its existence was breathed to myself, during my sojourn in Bombay, notwithstanding that, on the 7th of October, nearly a month before I left for Egypt, the Governor had been induced to append his signature to the following extraordinary minute. (B. B. p. 1245.)

"HAD Nursoo's application to retire from the public service ARISEN from his feeling it impossible to serve under Colonel Outram, *after what he may consider the unjust treatment he has met with at his hands,* IT WOULD BE BUT JUST TO ALLOW HIM TO RECONSIDER HIS APPLICATION, NOW THAT COLONEL OUTRAM IS NO LONGER AT BARODA.* BUT I find on reference to our records that his intention to retire on the completion of his 30 year's service *had*

---

vauntingly predicted that through the "*secret friendship*" of Mr. Reid, *he would be permitted to recall his resignation, and thus bring sorrow on all who had been gladdened by the prospect of his retirement.* And it was mentioned that (apparently to give an increased air of probability to a prediction which seemed so wildly improbable), Nursoo had intimated his *having sent a petition to Mr. Reid, accompanied by a letter of* PRIVATE ADVICE. Mr. Reid indignantly denies having received the private communication; but he does not deny having received the petition. This is not the only reason I have for stating that the petition WAS sent through Mr. Reid; though it is the only one I desire at present to assign. If I be in error, Mr. Reid can correct me by distinctly assigning to Lord Falkland, Mr. Willoughby, or Mr. Malet,—the only persons through whom the petition could have been laid before Government—the honour of having put it into "circulation." If these gentlemen accept the compliment I shall admit that I have been deceived. I shall not only regret my mistake, but apologise for it to Mr. Reid; and I shall publicly record that apology; though at the same time I shall be unable to add (the sequel will show why) that the confession of my error would tend in any very perceptible degree to improve the general aspect of Mr. Reid's case. The petition is "quoted *in extenso*" by Mr. Secretary Malet, B. B. p. 1244.

* I was STILL the "RESIDENT AT BARODA." My life may have been deemed precarious. I believe it was. But my sick leave had been granted only for *one year.* The appointment was still mine. Captain French was only my

been PREVIOUSLY *brought to our notice.* And I presume, therefore, that he has now no desire to continue in employment.* STILL, IF CAPTAIN FRENCH, WHO CAN AS YET HAVE ACQUIRED BUT LITTLE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE, SHOULD REQUIRE NURSOO PUNT'S SERVICES, I WOULD PERMIT HIM THE OPTION OF WITHDRAWING HIS APPLICATION. IF HE PERSIST IN HIS INTENTION TO RETIRE, he will of course receive his pension according to existing rules; but considering how his services in the revenue department have been rewarded, I DO NOT THINK THAT WE CAN ENTERTAIN ANY PROPOSITION FOR A FURTHER PENSION."*

Lord Falkland had not seen my Reports at the date of this minute. In the 12th par. of a minute dated 15th February 1850, (one of those about to be published in the return called for by Parliament on Mr. Otway's motion) he distinctly implies that the first of my two Reports had not come under his consideration till I had left for Egypt—that is, till after the 2nd November 1848. We have the declaration on the part of his Lordship, to the effect that when he *did* see my Reports, he regarded Nursoo Punt's conduct in an unfavorable light, and that he was only influenced to change his views by the councils of his civil colleagues, and "ESPECIALLY BY THE COGENT ARGUMENTS OF THE HONOURABLE MR. REID," *contained in the very minute written by that gentleman "as if for himself,"* (at some date not determined) and adopted and signed by his Lordship on the 29th of December. It is clear, then, either that this minute was written for Lord Falkland by some one who had seen my Reports, or that his Lordship was induced to write it on the representations of such a person.

That individual could hardly have been Mr. Willoughby. For Mr. Reid takes especial care to draw attention to Mr. Malet's declaration that my Report on the case of Gorajee Pol did not reach Bombay till the 18th September; and from that date till the 2nd November, I continued to receive Mr. Malet's assurances that my Reports "*were still in Mr. Reid's hands.*"

Was it Mr. Reid? The tone of the minute bears a marvellous resemblance to certain passages in the Pamphlet under notice, in

---

locum tenens. The native establishment over which Nursoo was invited to continue to preside, was the native establishment *of my office.*

* The writer of this minute did not require to search "*the records*" on the subject. *Vide* note to page 26.

which that gentleman, unmoved by subsequent revelations, does not hesitate to avow opinions which, *if correct*, would have justified the minute of the 7th of October; though they would *not* have justified it until their correctness had been placed beyond doubt, by a reference to myself. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Reid made no use of my Reports during their long detention in his hands. And he himself informs us (at page 34) that "Colonel Outram's Reports AT ONCE showed him that the affair was "one of a very ordinary nature—*that it was simply A* STRUGGLE, "*such as are constantly occurring in every office in India where* "*natives are serving*, for mastery!" At page 35 he again tells us that his scrutiny of the papers "established in his mind the conviction, that this was—*an attempt to make Nursoo a victim of an ordinary party struggle.*" While at page 49, with a full knowledge of all that has since been established, he takes credit to himself for having been the means of "*preventing Nursoo being driven from his office unjustly.*" If Mr. Reid DID express such sentiments to his colleagues on or before the 7th of October, it can hardly be a matter of surprise, that they should have accepted the representations of one who had enjoyed such unusual facilities for making himself acquainted with the minutest details of my reports. If he DID NOT express such sentiments to his colleagues, if in fact he was not the virtual author of the minute of the 7th of October, that minute becomes an unfathomable mystery. For though, as afterwards appeared, Nursoo had boastfully predicted that he would, through the "secret friendship" of Mr. Reid, be permitted to recall his resignation, his petition did not even remotely insinuate that his retirement had been accelerated by my suspicions of his collusion with Baba Nafra. *It did not even in the most indirect manner imply a wish to recall his resignation.* It simply begged that he might not be condemned unheard. And the only reasonable interpretation of which that request was susceptible, was that his application for pension might not be prejudiced by my reports, until he had had an opportunity of explaining his conduct.

Whether, along with Nursoo's irregularly received petition was

circulated some "memorandum" or other document from the pen of Mr. Reid, or whether Mr. Reid made a verbal communication to Lord Falkland on the subject, or whether, as in a case we shall presently notice, Mr. Reid (p. 30,) "*wrote, as for himself, a draft minute which formed the ground-work of that finally adopted by the Governor,*" and which, "*having met his approbation, was taken by the Chief Secretary, or delivered to his officer in order to be worked up in its present form, as the minute of the President,*"—I cannot pretend to determine.

But I feel assured, that no one, taking the entire circumstances into consideration, will accuse me of venturing on an unwarrantable liberty, if (until Mr. Reid shall have solemnly asserted the contrary) I surmise, that to him belongs, exclusively, the honour of this notable minute: a minute in which, without being called on for a single explanation, or being afforded an opportunity of vindicating myself, I was virtually accused of having done such injustice to an unimpeachable subordinate, as would have afforded an adequate explanation of his resignation: and a minute in which, though it is admitted that Nursoo's resignation was *not* caused by the "*unjust treatment he had received at my hands,*" this since convicted betrayer of my confidence was invited to recall his resignation; while my *locum tenens* was stimulated not only to sanction, but to urge, the recal, by every consideration most likely to be influential over him—by allusions to the valuable, and almost *indispensible* aid he might calculate on receiving from Nursoo—by the natural sympathy which every upright man must feel for persecuted worth—by an intelligible hint that the Government to whom he owed his own recent preferment wished him to retain Nursoo—and by the intimation that if Nursoo "PERSISTED" in retiring he would do so under disadvantageous pecuniary circumstances.

If it be so, that Mr. Reid was the real author of the "Minute" of the 7th of October, the reader will not marvel that the Baroda corruptionists who, as Mr. Reid himself admits (p. 54), obtained from the secret department of the Secretariat all the information they desired, should have found credence for their boasts that Mr. Reid was their friend, when addressing men already thoroughly

satisfied in their own minds of the corruptibility of high functionaries. But even were Mr. Reid to prove that he was *not* the real author of the "Minute" in question, the fact would in nowise tend to weaken the plausible grounds on which, as I reported to Government, the natives justified their belief in Mr. Reid's corruption. For when I made those Reports, I was ignorant of the manner in which my Reports, taken into consideration in November, had been virtually prejudged in October. I have, however, the less hesitation in recording a surmise that Mr. Reid was the author (virtual or real) of the "Minute," inasmuch as that gentleman's declarations, in reference to the share taken by him in the disposal of Nursoo's case, stand in such singular antagonism to each other, and to the statements of Lord Falkland, that only on the hypothesis adverted to, can aught in any way approaching to even a partial reconcilement be effected. Thus, at page 61, he declares that he had "*no more concern*" with it "*than any other member of the Government;* though at page 30 he admits that he was himself the sole and exclusive author of the elaborate vindication afterwards penned, in which Nursoo's reinstatal was justified—an admission completely borne out by the declaration of Lord Falkland, that he believed Nursoo to be guilty till induced to change his mind by the views of his civil colleagues, and especially by "*the cogent arguments of Mr. Reid.*" How thoroughly confused Mr. Reid's ideas on this and kindred subjects are, and therefore how cautiously his assertions must be received, has already been shown in more than one instance. And a striking illustration of the same fact is given in the subjoined note.*

---

* I subjoin two passages, in which Mr. Reid endeavours to prove that my Reports could not have been detained in his hands.

Mr. REID	*versus*	Mr. REID.
"It is IMPOSSIBLE to suppose that the Governor *could* have written this (minute of the 7th October) or that his council *would* have concurred in it---it does not appear *when* they concurred---*had they not*		"After the foregoing exposition of dates and facts, how is it possible to uphold Colonel Outram's declaration, so far as this letter of the 31st August is concerned, that any delay whatever originated with me? *The Go-*

About, or soon after, the period of my departure for Egypt, the papers would seem to have been released from Mr. Reid's

---

ALL *had under their consideration* THE WHOLE OF THE PAPERS *connected with the charge of misconduct* BROUGHT *against Nursoo Punt in the two cases submitted by Colonel Outram.* This, be it observed, was about a month before Colonel Outram left for Egypt. WHAT THEN BECOMES OF THE DELAY ATTRIBUTED BY COLONEL OUTRAM, SO OFTEN AND SO POINTEDLY, TO ME ALONE?"

Mr. Reid's "Letter," P. 31.

vernor's minute of the 20th November MUST *have been framed* BEFORE I SAW THE PAPERS AT ALL. BECAUSE (!) *its views as to the settlement of the debt differed from mine.* AND, AS MY MINUTE IS DATED the 24th November 1848, I MUST have been rapid, rather than dilatory, in coming to a decision."

Mr. Reid's "Letter," P. 29.

In his minute of the 15th November, 1850, Lord Falkland declares that up to the date of my departure for Egypt, (2ND NOVEMBER 1848) "*the decision of Government as to the guilt or innocence of Nursoo Punt could not be anticipated.*" And in another minute, as we have seen, he declares that the first of my Reports had not come under his consideration when I left for Egypt. Couple these declarations with his Lordship's admission that, till convinced by the "cogent arguments" of Mr. Reid, the effect of my Reports on his mind was "unfavorable to the native agent;" and we have, I think, tolerably strong grounds for assuming that when he appended his signature to the "Minute" of the 7th October he must have been led to believe (what Mr. Reid's perusal of my Reports "AT ONCE" satisfied that gentleman) that I had preferred some trumpery and unjust charges against Nursoo, the object of which was to make him "the victim of an ordinary party struggle." To these considerations add the fact, that neither Mr. Malet nor Lord Falkland offer the faintest suggestion, that in attributing the long detention of my papers to Mr. Reid, I did, or possibly might be doing, injustice to that gentleman. Let due weight be given to the strange misconceptions which Mr. Reid evinces in his Pamphlet regarding the real nature of the questions that came before him, in the autumn of 1848. Let his extraordinary repudiation of all that has since been established against Nursoo Punt be kept in view. Let regard be had to the singular self-contradictions, within the compass of three pages, which stand at the head of this note—and to the illustrations already given of the loose manner in which Mr. Reid refers to official documents—and a mass of presumptive evidence is afforded, which will I think satisfy the reader, not only that my reports *did* remain in that gentleman's hands till my departure for Egypt, but that to him belongs the honour of the "Minute" of the 7th of October.

custody. And on the 20th November Lord Falkland's signature was appended to a minute on my report of the 31st August—that on the case of Govind Row—and as the ultimate decision on this, as well as on the case of Gorajee Pol, was attributed to the influence of Mr. Reid, I crave the reader's attention to the details about to be given.

The claim which Nursoo Punt's relative, Baba Nafra, had preferred against Govind Row, amounted to £30,313; and of this exorbitant demand, by far the greater portion was, as has been already stated, based on the fraudulent substitution of one document for another—a fraud, Nursoo Punt's collusion with which has now been established to the satisfaction of Mr. Frere, the Board of Control, and the Court of Directors.* After consultation with the ablest accountants I had it in my power to consult at Baroda, I estimated the debt justly due at £8315. And Lord Falkland—or the writer of the draft of the minute bearing his signature—still further reduced my estimate by £1438, giving £6877 as the *bonâ fide* obligations of Govind Row. His Lordship was, at the same time, in favour of annulling the bank's guarantee; even though the writer of his "minute" does not seem to have brought to his notice the charge which I had preferred, of fraudulent substitution. As, however, "the whole question" was one requiring Indian knowledge and experience, he desired to have

* In the correspondence both documents have been called "bonds;" I therefore retain the term, though somewhat inaccurate. The transaction was this. In 1820, Govind Row passed to the bank a bond for rupees 9001, on which he agreed to pay 12 per cent. interest. In 1830, the Resident, having been called upon to put Govind Row's pecuniary affairs into order, called for a statement of his debts. Amongst others was one item for rupees 9000. Twelve years after the arrangements made for the liquidation of the debt of which this was an item---the Resident who made the arrangement being dead---the bank produced the old and invalid bond of 1820, and pretended that it was the acknowledgment of the debt of rupees 9000, referred to in the accounts of 1830, and that the Resident had recognized its validity. In other words, it was alleged that the debt of rupees 32,000, recognized in 1830, and of which one item was rupees 9000, was, in reality, a debt of that amount PLUS the amount compound interest, at the rate of 12 per cent., which had accrued on the sum of rupees 9001, since 1820.

the "opinion" of his colleagues before pronouncing a definite judgment.*

From Lord Falkland the papers passed to Mr. Reid; and on the 24th of November that gentleman minuted as follows:—

"I quite concur in the expediency of withdrawing our 'Bhandaries,' "(guarantees) when their duration depends on the conduct of the parties "holding them, and when that conduct shall be such as to justify our adopting "that extreme measure. *But I cannot think* THAT THE MERE DEMAND FOR A "DEBT, *however exorbitant, is a sufficient breach of good conduct.* The firm "is not without *some ground* for all its demands. We may not admit them, "*but we have no right to punish it for having advanced them.* There have been "no forgeries, no denials of payment made to the firm, and NO FRAUDS, *if* "*we except the abstraction of the correspondence from the Residency Records,* "for which, on the absence of all proof, we can have no right to make the "firm responsible. Commercial morality is, I fear, not at so high a standard "among our countrymen in India that we could, with any reason, visit so "severely *the offence committed by a native banker for trying to exact from his* "*creditor every pie which he thought might be screwed out of him, by the widest* "*interpretation of his bonds.* IN THIS CASE I WOULD CERTAINLY ABANDON "THE IDEA OF INTERFERING WITH THE BHANDARIE."†

---

* Mr. Reid does not in his Pamphlet avow that Lord Falkland was in favour of annulling the "guarantee" till induced by his colleagues, and more especially by Mr. Reid himself, to change his views. In fact, Mr. Reid's remarks would seem to imply that his Lordship had not bestowed a thought on the subject. I therefore subjoin, in parallel columns, Lord Falkland's remarks, and Mr. Reid's allusion to them.

Lord Falkland's Minute, 20th November 1848.	Mr. Reid's version thereof in 1853.
"*Mixed up with this question* is the behaviour of the firm of Hurree Bhugtee, who have advanced a claim on the bonds I have above considered to a sum amounting to Rs. 303,130: 9:9. The amount I consider now due sufficiently marks the view I take of this transaction; *and I am disposed to adopt Colonel Outram's recommendation to cancel the guarantee formerly extended to the firm.* But, ON THE WHOLE OF THE QUESTION, I should wish to be favoured with the opinion of my colleagues." Minute of the 20th November 1848, ordered by Parliament, on the motion of Mr. Otway, M.P. for Stafford.	"Lord Falkland's minute bears date 20th November, 1848, that is, seventeen days after Colonel Outram had gone to Egypt. *He proposed the reduction of the above sum to Rs.* 68,777, *and requested the opinion of his colleagues on the question of withdrawing the guarantee.*"—Mr. Reid's Letter, p. 27.

† I had, in my report, alluded to the fact that most of the documents

After what has been already detailed, it is hardly necessary to point out, that in the passage of his minute just quoted, Mr. Reid promulgated an *entirely erroneous view of the facts of the case.* The offence on which I justified my recommendation that the guarantee should be annulled, did *not*, as Mr. Reid officially recorded, consist in the fact of Baba Nafra having made a "*mere demand* "*for an exorbitant debt,*" or in the fact of his having "*tried to* "*exact from his creditor every pie which he thought could be screwed* "*out of him by the widest interpretation of his bonds*"—though even the admitted extortions, coupled with the previous character of the house and of Baba Nafra, would, in my own opinion, as in that originally held by Lord Falkland, have justified the abrogation of the guarantee. But the charge, on the strength of which I had urged that measure, was, that Baba Nafra, taking advantage of the silliness and improvidence of his debtor, had substituted for a bond given in 1830, an old (and invalid) bond which had been assigned to him in 1820; and that, *on this* FRAUDULENT SUBSTITUTION *he had based certain* UNJUST AND MONSTROUS DEMANDS. This was the charge. And this charge Mr. Reid utterly passed by when he declared that NO FRAUDS had been committed.

These errors on the part of Mr. Reid are the more extraordinary, inasmuch as he had long been conversant with native accounts, and was singularly well qualified to appreciate the value of those features in the substituted bond on which I based my arguments. And they become still more remarkable when it is borne in mind that (as he tells us at page 27,) he "*entered minutely into the case,*"

---

referring to the case of Govind Row, and calculated to prove the iniquitous nature of the demands made by Nafra, *had been abstracted from my office*; and as their abstraction could not possibly have been for the advantage of any one save Nafra (and the bank of which he was the manager); and as Government were well aware that the bank had before been convicted of tampering with the native officers of the Residency, I conceived that there were good reasons to suspect the bank people of having secured the abstraction of the missing documents. These remarks are necessary to explain one of Mr. Reid's allusions.

and that (page 35,) "*deeming it his bounden duty to enter into a careful scrutiny of all that was laid before Government, he did so as he would have gone into a judicial case.*"

Mr. Reid did not, in this minute, enter into any formal vindication of Nursoo Punt. He intimated that he would defer his remarks till he came to minute on the case of Gorajie Pol. But at the same time he pronounced the most satisfactory practical exoneration of him from all blame that could possibly have been afforded. For as NO FRAUDS had been attempted, it was obvious that the "apathy and culpable negligence," which the conduct of Nursoo Punt, in reference to the alleged fraud, had led me to record against him, could have no existence except in my own "credulous" and "easily worked upon" mind. And not satisfied with this negative demonstration of the injustice I had done to that immaculate public servant, Mr. Ried implied a triumphant proof that Nursoo could have had no "corrupt collusion" with Baba Nafra, by basing his award to the latter of a still smaller sum than even Lord Falkland had proposed,—on an *alleged* "SUGGESTION" of the native agent.

After Nursoo had become aware that the frauds of his relative, Baba Nafra, were no longer susceptible of concealment, I addressed to him a series of interrogations, as to why he had failed to point out to me the suspicious features of Nafra's claims. And, with a view to exculpate himself, he pretended that he had all along contemplated the adoption of the Hindoo rule of "*damdooput*,"—which prescribes that the interest payable on a debt should not exceed the amount of the principal—a pretext transparently and impudently untrue. (B.B. p. 970.) Yet Mr. Reid fell into the mistake of citing as a laudable and sagacious "suggestion," this fear-extorted equivocation, by which Nursoo endeavoured to extricate himself from a scrape, when he saw that, in spite of all his efforts to deceive me, I had discovered the frauds, and meant to disallow the extortions of his kinsman! After enumerating the embarrassments that beset the Government, in determining the sum that ought to be allowed to the bank, Mr. Reid thus wrote—

"But I think a way is open to us of reducing the demands to a reasonable "amount, without apparently infringing our 'guarantee,' that is, by not "allowing the interest to exceed the principal. '*Dam dooput*' is a native "rule in such transactions, and considering the nature of the case, and the "attempt made by the firm to secure such usurious profits, I think we "should be quite justified in adopting it. NURSOO PUNT, *in his answer to "the second question in the accompaniment D*, SUGGESTS THIS MODE OF "SETTLEMENT."

And strange to say, Mr. Reid—proof against evidence which appears conclusive to all who have studied the matter, save himself and Lord Falkland's colleague Mr. Bell,—does not hesitate to adduce this "suggestion," in 1853, as a proof that Nursoo could not possibly have been in collusion with Nafra in 1848. At page 56 of his "Letter," he parades as a fact, inconsistent with any hypothesis save the one which assumes that Nursoo acted "*on a right sense of duty*," that "*he* SUGGESTED *a mode of settlement by which the firm was to receive even a smaller sum than Colonel Outram awarded.*"

It is nothing to Mr. Reid that Mr. Frere had judicially determined that Nursoo's so called "SUGGESTION"—"*had come too late to "save him, when his report, which ought to have exonerated him, had "been condemned, and he had been compelled to produce papers "which showed that the claim for interest then urged, was, to some "extent, fraudulent.*" (B.B. p. 1050.) It is nothing that Mr. Frere convicted Nursoo, either legally or morally, of other offences, involving a corrupt and mercenary collusion with Nafra, and an improper use of Mr. Reid's own name. It is nothing that the Bombay Government (Mr. Bell excepted) have felt compelled to acknowledge the truth of most of Mr. Frere's judicial affirmations. It is nothing that the Court of Directors and the Board of Control have adopted Mr. Frere's decisions more unreservedly than the Bombay Government. All these considerations are valueless in the estimation of Mr. Reid, when opposed to his own unerring intuitions of Nursoo's immaculate purity. True, Nursoo's self-transfer from Poonah to Baroda in 1843 was suggestive of suspicion.—True, Mr. Reid was at that date oppressed with anxiety lest Nursoo should acquire "*contamination*" from breathing the

political atmosphere of that "*sink of villainy.*"—True, he found in 1844 that the object of his solicitude was actually related by family ties to some of the vilest of the Baroda corruptionists.—Yet will he not suffer such trumpery reflections to influence the unbounded confidence he reposes in the unsullied purity of that public servant through whom his own name came to be associated with "the foulest of deeds and the vilest of men," and who had contrived to make the people of Baroda think that he and his wealthy kinsman held the reputation of Mr. Reid and others at their mercy. And while endeavouring to find converts to this generous faith, he charitably abstains from mentioning the considerations which, if submitted to his readers, might militate against their acceptance of so wonderful and mysterious a creed.

To return to matters more immediately connected with Mr. Reid's minute. It did not escape the notice of the Court of Directors, that the fraudulent substitution of one document for another, on which I had based my recommendation of the annulment of the bank's guarantee, had not been specifically alluded to (if indeed considered) by the Secretary who drafted Lord Falkland's minute; nor by Mr. Reid, who bestowed a judicial investigation on the case; nor by Mr. Willoughby, who was induced to concur in Mr. Reid's exposition of its merits. A reference on the subject was accordingly made by the Court to the Bombay Government; and that body were subsequently rebuked, not only for having evaded the reference, but for having, in evading it, made an assertion inconsistent with fact. The despatch in which this censure was conveyed bore date the 13th February 1850. And Mr. Reid, extracting half a sentence from it, applies the garbled quotation to a useful controversial purpose at page 46 of his "Letter." It is made to do duty both in vindication of Mr. Reid and in disparagement of myself, in a passage in which he summarizes what, according to his own statement, he had previously proved. In order to display to full advantage the felicity of the arrangement, I take the liberty of subjoining, in parallel columns, the words of the Court of Directors and Mr. Reid's ingenious condensation of their disagreeably prolix remarks.

Mr. Reid's Words.

I have already shewn * * * that the Government did not, in that case, solemnly ignore a charge of forgery well supported by proof. The most that Colonel Outram himself has ever tried to make of the case, even when his feelings had been excited to the utmost, after his return from Egypt, is to call it a charge of "constructive forgery;" and though the Court of Directors, in their letter of the 13th February, 1850, DIFFERED IN OPINION *from the Government,* SO FAR *as to think that the substitution of one bond for another would, if proved, be an offence which ought to involve the withdrawal of the guarantee; yet, in directing that further investigation should be made,* THEY SPECIALLY OBSERVED *that* "*the case was not brought very clearly before Government, in Colonel Outram's letter.*—Mr. Reid's "Letter," pp. 45-6.

Those of the Court of Directors.

"We HAD called your attention to the opinion of Lieutenant Colonel Outram, that the firm of Hurree Bhugtee had substituted a false bond, bearing interest, for Rupees 9,001, in the room of a mere acknowledgment of a balance of debt, an act which, if committed, would amount to forfeiture of your Bhandarie. You now, after a reference to Captain French, *report that* NO PROOFS EXIST IN SUPPORT OF LIEUTENANT COL. OUTRAM'S SUSPICIONS. *This is more than is borne out by the report of Captain French, who merely stated that he was* "*not aware of any* "*grounds beyond those stated by Lieu-*" *tenant Col. Outram, for supposing,* "*&c.;*" *having previously stated that* "NO FURTHER STEPS HAD BEEN TAKEN TO ASCERTAIN THE TRUE STATE OF THE CASE."

"The grounds adduced by Lieutenant Colonel Outram were STRONG, and in his opinion conclusive. HE DISTINCTLY STATED, in par. 49 of his Report, of the 31st August 1848, that the soucar (banker) had substituted for the receipt passed in 1830, a former bond of 9,001 rupees, dated 4th February, 1820, not indorsed by the Resident, and produced it as having been confirmed by the Resident in this item. *The case certainly was not brought very clearly before Government in Lieutenant Colonel Outram's letter.* BUT *we should have expected that if his conclusion was not admitted, the insufficiency of his reasons would have been shown, or the subject referred to him for further explanation.* We desire that the question be taken into the deliberate consideration of your Government, in order that in the event of Lieutenant Colonel Outram's opinion being found correct, you may annul the Bhandarie.*—Dispatch of the 13th February, 1850, ordered by the House of Commons, on Mr. Otway's motion.

* In obedience to this mandate, the Bombay Government (of which Mr. Reid had ceased to be a member in March 1849) referred to me for further information. On the 30th July 1850, I forwarded my reply—which was

The excuse made by Lord Falkland for not having adopted the course which the Court of Directors "should have expected," was that I had left for Egypt before the case came before him. But as

---

not transmitted to the Court of Directors till the 17th September 1851. In transmitting it, the Bombay Government admitted that my original charges were well founded. And in noticing their dispatch, the Court thus commenced their remarks. "On receipt of our letter dated 13th of February 1850, *previously to which you had* ENTIRELY PASSED OVER *the grave accusations brought by Lieutenant Colonel Outram against the firm of Hurree Bhugtee, you called on that officer, &c., &c.*" The reason assigned by the Government for withholding from the Court of Directors, for thirteen months and a half, my second report on the subject, was that they waited till the other charges against Baba Nafra, in connection with Joitabhae, should be disposed of. How far this long delay tended to increase the difficulties I had to surmount in prosecuting Nursoo Punt is shown at pages 1436-40 of the Baroda Blue Book. And how far it was necessary to defer replying to the reiterated references of the Court on the subject of the ignored fraud, till five and a half months after the receipt of my report on the case of Joitabhae, is a matter on which it is not my province to offer an *opinion*.

But, while on this subject, I may draw attention to the fact, that in his minute of the 11th November 1850 (transmitted to London, as I have said, only the 17th September 1851), Lord Falkland seems to attribute to Mr. Reid any blame that might be supposed to rest on the Government, for having "entirely passed over" my charge against the bank, made in 1848: inasmuch as that gentleman, in recording that "NO FORGERIES" had been committed, confused his colleagues as to the real nature of my charge. This, his Lordship admits, was "*not that a claim was made on a forged bond, but* "*that a false charge was made on the bond for rupees* 9001. It is (continues his Lordship) expressly stated in Mr. Reid's minute, that there had "been NO FORGERIES; the term forged bond has therefore been improperly "used in our resolution * * * The actual accusation made by Colonel "Outram in the 4th paragraph of his Letter of the 31st August 1848, "was, that the firm, to justify their claim for having interest on the sum of "rupees 9000 inserted in the document signed by Mr. Williams on the 29th "October 1830, produced a bond for rupees 9001, dated 4th February "1820, *which Colonel Outram, for the reasons adduced in his 4th paragraph,* "*stated* COULD NOT *have reference to the item of rupees* 9000, *above alluded to,* "*as entered on the document signed by Mr. Williams.* On the whole transaction, I was much disposed to adopt Colonel Outram's recommendation "to cancel the guarantee; but my civil colleagues, Messrs. Reid and Willoughby, did not consider this measure advisable, and to their opinion I "deferred."

his Lordship's "minute" was written within 18 days after my departure, it is not unreasonable to infer that, had my report dated the 31st August, instead of being detained "in Mr. Reid's hands," been put into active "circulation" as soon as it was received—or even on the 18th of September—the case might probably have been taken into consideration before the 2nd of November, the date on which I sailed for Egypt. Not only, however, were my own offers to "complete what was defective, and clear up what might be obscure" in my reports, unheeded, but, (till the Court's despatch compelled it) no reference was made to the Acting Resident, to whom (and not to me) Mr. Reid says (p. 33) the Government would have chosen to apply, "if further information in regard to any point seemed to be requisite."

From no desire to do so, I am ready to believe, but with the undoubted effect of mystifying and deceiving the reader, Mr. Reid appears inclined to claim credit for certain beneficial results which subsequently flowed from maintaining the guarantee in 1848. At page 28 he thus writes:—

"Colonel Outram, throughout the Blue Book, denounces the Government for the iniquity of its decision in not carrying out his suggestion of withdrawing the guarantee. It did not apparently occur to him that had his advice been followed, the "atrocious" case of Joitabhae could never have come under the cognizance of any British authority. It was solely as widow of a member of a firm possessing the guarantee that she could claim the interference of the British Government; and the cancelling of the guarantee would at once have abandoned her to the tender mercies of the Baroda Durbar. Colonel Outram cannot say that he desired to punish Baba Nafra only; for in his letter of the 31st August 1848, par. 8, he particularly alludes to the widows and children of the late Soucar (banker), as having, in conjunction with the firm they carry on in his name, fairly forfeited the protection, &c., 'by dishonesty in their pecuniary transactions, through their managing partner and representative, Baba Nafra.' Is it not a fair deduction from these facts, that up to the date of the letter in question, Colonel Outram did not think Joitabhae the injured person he has since declared her to be."

Mr. Reid ought to be aware, that, from beginning to end of the Blue Book, I never once "*denounced the iniquity*" of any one of the decisions of Government,—though I deemed it my duty to show that many of their decisions were intrinsically erroneous,

and calculated to promote the popular belief in their own corruptibility, and in that of Mr. Reid. He ought to be equally well aware, that, as my Report shows on its very face, it was not till July 1850 that the revelations were made to me on which I drew up my Report of March 1851—a Report which completely satisfied the Court of Directors that Joitabhae *was* the injured person I declared her to be, and that, in spite of Mr. Reid's sneer, her case *was* an "ATROCIOUS" one.* A slight mental effort would have brought to his recollection that in ignoring the fraud on which I recommended the annulment of the guarantee, neither he nor his colleagues ever alluded in the most distant manner to the probable consequences of the annulment, on the fate of the "widows and children of the late banker." A moment's reflection would have satisfied him that if the continuation of the guarantee was intrinsically "iniquitous,"—the guilt of those who continued it could not possibly be rendered less by the fact that their crime had resulted in certain beneficial consequences, not contemplated by themselves at the date of its commission. And, he might, moreover, have perceived, that the passage above quoted from page 28, affords something very like a refutation of the passage at page 56 of his "Letter," in which he endeavours to prove that there could not possibly be any collusion between Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra. The passage is this—

"Colonel Outram assumes, in many parts of his proceedings, a simulated hostility between Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra. BUT SO FAR AS I CAN DISCOVER THIS IS A MERE ASSUMPTION. And it is opposed by two facts which at the moment occur to me: first, that in the case of Govind Row Guicowar, instead of supporting Baba Nafra's claim to the exorbitant sum of about three lakhs of rupees, Nursoo Punt suggested a settlement by which the

* It is a curious coincidence, that this expression, sneeringly applied by Mr. Reid to the persecutions of a sorely injured lady, is the very one made use of by Colonel Sykes, when, along with other Directors, he protested against the insufficiency of the censure addressed by the Court to the Bombay Government, for the manner in which my investigations had been treated. For the protests of Colonel Sykes and his brother Directors, designated by the "Times," "elaborate and eloquent," see Mr. John Chapman's work, "Baroda and Bombay—their Political Morality:" Published by Mr. J. Chapman, 142, Strand.

firm was to receive a smaller sum than Colonel Outram awarded; and, secondly, that Captain French, whom Colonel Outram describes as a mere tool in his native agent's hands, recommended to Government the entire withdrawal of the guarantee. *These facts are irreconcileable with simulated hostility, and real friendship, and are in truth only to be accounted for on* "WHAT IT IS NOT IN EVERY MAN'S NATURE TO ADMIT TO AN OPPONENT, *viz.*, A RIGHT SENSE OF DUTY."

A few words will enable the reader fully to understand how completely Mr. Reid, in the one passage, destroys the arguments which he advances in the other. As both Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra professed feelings of hostility one against the other, this hostility was necessarily real or simulated. So at least it appeared to my own humble perceptions. And I was rash enough to conclude, that the hostility of Nursoo to the man with whom he was in collusion, not in my own opinion only, but in the opinions of Mr. Frere, of the Bombay Government, of the Court of Directors, and of the Board of Control, was more likely to be simulated than real. Under these circumstances, and possibly being, as Mr. Reid with his wonted courtesy, implies, incapable of harbouring sentiments of honor, generosity, or even justice, towards "AN OPPONENT," I DID venture to assume, and on this assumption to report, that the professed hostility of the two worthies whom Mr. Reid appears anxious to take under the shelter of his protection, was a piece of simulation. But I did NOT, as Mr. Reid has fallen into the mistake of asserting, describe Captain French as "a mere tool in his native agent's hands." In common with Lord Falkland, and the Indian authorities in this country, I did, and do believe, that he was grossly deceived, and his confidence shamefully abused by Nursoo Punt; and that, giving credence to Nursoo's reports, as it was natural he should, (after the tribute to Nursoo's worth which Mr. Reid had extorted from his colleagues in the government,) he was led into the adoption of measures, which, but for that "domestic treachery," as Lord Falkland calls it, he never would have adopted. And, with the Indian authorities in this country, I hold that our common belief ought in no wise to be shaken by the generous and chivalrous readiness of Captain French, to take on himself the sole and undivided responsibility of the course pursued towards Nafra's

victim Joitabhae. That generous readiness afforded a measure of his own magnanimity; it was no test of his servant's fidelity.

Having premised these observations, and referring the reader to what has been urged at pages 43 and 44 in reference to the first of the two "FACTS" adduced by Mr. Reid in the foregoing passage of his "Letter," I beg him to understand that at the period when Captain French recommended the annulment of the guarantee, the position of affairs rendered it of the utmost importance to Baba Nafra, that the case of his victim should not come under the cognizance of the British authorities. The recommendation was made on the 22nd February 1849, when the powerful and affecting appeals of the persecuted widow became too strong to be altogether unheeded; and when those appeals, but for the "domestic treachery" with which the acting Resident was surrounded, would have satisfied both him and the Government, that the representations on which alone the British interference in her behalf was withheld, were contrary to the facts of the case. Baba Nafra was then rioting in unrestrained control over the enormous wealth of the Bank; the Guicowar authorities were in league with him; the only danger with which he was menaced consisted in the possibility of the case being, in spite of all his manœuvres, dragged in appeal before the Resident; and only in virtue of the "guarantee" hitherto so cherished, could such an appeal be made. Its abolition, therefore, became an object to him; and in my Report on the case, in alluding to Captain French's recommendation, I wrote the following remarks, somewhat incongruously cited in the margin of Mr. Reid's "Letter," (p. 56), as bearing out this opinion, that Nursoo's anxiety to see the guarantee annulled in February, 1849, afforded proofs that he could NOT have been in collusion with Baba Nafra.

"Though Captain French and myself have ever been as one in our general condemnation of 'guarantees,' yet I feel assured that that officer would not have written as he did, *had not his mind been poisoned by the erroneous information and interested suggestions of his native agent*, WHO *while cunningly professing to desire to see a blow struck at the house of which Baba Nafra was manager*, RECOMMENDED A MEASURE WHICH, IF CARRIED OUT, WOULD HAVE AFFORDED HIM IMPUNITY FOR ALL HIS PAST MISDEEDS, AND HAVE RENDERED HIM IRRESPONSIBLE FOR HIS AFTER CONDUCT AS MANAGER OF THE BANK." B.B. p. 350. So completely did Captain French promote the objects of Baba Nafra, and destroy the prospects of Joitabhae, by urging his recom-

mendation at that particular juncture, that, as will be seen hereafter, Joitabhae regarded the recommendation as *virtually a sentence of death against herself.* If, she argued, Baba Nafra's power enables him with impunity to abduct his master's orphan; imprison, defame, insult, and plunder, his widow, in spite of the British guarantee, what will prevent him murdering the widow when the guarantee is abrogated. And she argued not badly.*

I have paused longer than I intended on Mr. Reid's share in the consultations and "minutes" relating to my Report of the 31st August, 1848, and on his subsequent rather curious allusions to these matters, because his very peculiar controversial tactics render it necessary, not only to show the fallacious nature of his reasoning, and the inconsistency with fact of his statements, but to do this so effectually as to prevent his being able to reproduce the one or the other,—so effectually, at all events, as to save myself from the necessity of noticing any publication he may put forth of the character of the "Letter" now under notice.

From Mr. Reid my Report passed to Mr. Willoughby, who on the 28th of November again sent it into circulation, without comment. It reached him a second time; on the 2nd of December he entered a minute in which he concurred in the views of Mr. Reid; and on the 5th of December the matter was finally disposed of in the following minute, under the signature of Lord Falkland, and "concurred in" by his colleagues.

"As my colleagues concur in opinion that there is nothing in this case "which ought to induce us to deprive Hurree Bhugtee of the advantages of "the Government guarantee, I defer to their opinion. And I also assent to "the mode of settlement which they suggest, and which is detailed in Mr. "Reid's minute."

On the 15th of December the results of their deliberations were communicated to my *locum tenens,* in a letter in which not the most remote allusion was made to my recommendation of the annulment of the guarantee, or to the alleged misconduct of the native agent in this case.

On the latter point, as I have already stated, Mr. Reid, (though in his minute of the 24th November he had practically exonerated Nursoo Punt from all blame,) deferred his formal vindication of

* The painfully interesting case of Joitabhae Settanee will be found fully detailed in the Blue Books, pp. 319-392, followed by the minutes and correspondence connected with, or arising out of it.

the native agent till he should come to "minute" remarks on the case of Gorajie Pol. And when the time had arrived for the performance of this duty he prepared an elaborate exposition of the unjustly assailed probity of the immaculate Nursoo, so ingenious as almost to tempt one to regret that it was based on gratuitous assumptions, fallacious arguments, and the non recognition of important and somewhat obvious facts. Whether modesty, or some other motive, influenced him, I am not in a position to determine; but so it is, that Mr. Reid, satisfied with the consciousness of its authorship, resigned in favor of Lord Falkland the honor of having prepared this ingenious vindication of the now judicially-convicted culprit, and contented himself in 1848 with "simply subscribing" his own minute, after it had been adopted by and "put forth by the Governor."

Mr. Reid's account of the transaction is thus given, at page 29 of his "Letter:"

"The Governor's 'minute' on this letter is dated the 28th of December, 1848. *Of that minute, so far as it disposes of the allegations against Nursoo Punt, I am most willing to take on myself all the responsibility. The views contained in it were my views.* THERE IS NOT ONE LINE WHICH, ON RECONSIDERATION, I SHOULD DESIRE TO ALTER. It was written on the advice which I gave in perfect honesty and good faith. If my memory serves me right, *I wrote,* AS FOR MYSELF, *a draft of minute which formed the ground-work of that finally adopted by the Governor.* I have discovered no record of the date when my draft was submitted to the Governor; or, when the views in it having met his approbation, *it was taken to the Chief Secretary, or delivered into his office, to be worked up, in its present form, as the minute of the President. It must, however, have been well known to many clerks in the office,* AND THROUGH THEM *to* COLONEL OUTRAM *and his informants, that the Governor's minute was framed on my original draft.* HENCE THE ANIMOSITY OF THE WHOLE PARTY AGAINST ME IN PARTICULAR. For the reasons above detailed, I simply subscribed the minute, as put forth by the Governor. Mr. Willoughby recorded a separate minute on the 31st October 1848. The decision on these minutes was sent to the acting Resident on the 12th of January 1849."

Mr. Reid's undeviating adherence to his elaborate defence of Nursoo, of which a categorical refutation will be found in the Blue Books (pp. 962-978), and which has since received a more practical refutation in Mr. Frere's decision, and in the punitive measures of the Court of Directors, is a psychical phenomenon which I am not required to explain. Nor, save by a flat and indignant denial, is it necessary for me to meet his insinuation

that I was on terms of intimacy with, or would have consented to receive information from, the corrupt clerks in his own secretariat, whom I afterwards convicted of selling the most secret minutes and consultations of Government. But I may mention, that not till I read Mr. Reid's Pamphlet had I any conception of the extent to which he appears to have exercised those functions ostensibly vested in Lord Falkland. I did, indeed, imagine that he must have influenced the decisions of his colleagues, for I did not believe that Mr. Secretary Malet, whose duty it was (according to the exposition given by Mr. Reid, p. 5,) to draw out the Governor's minutes, would have recommended the continuance of a guarantee to the bank, from whose shameful misconduct he had himself experienced so many official annoyances and embarrassments. I did not think that Mr. Willoughby would have acquiesced in such a decision as was arrived at, unless influenced by the opinions of others; and I knew that my Report had been in Mr. Reid's hands for a length of time, which justified the conclusion that he had taken them under his special control. But I never conceived that the business of Government was conducted in the manner now revealed by Mr. Reid—a manner as remote as possible from that scheme of procedure which Mr. Reid himself, at page 5 of his Pamphlet, details as adopted "*in all cases.*"*

* Mr. Reid devotes a few pages at the commencement of his "Letter" to an exposition of the mode in which the consultations of Government are conducted; as he considers these "remarks necessary to the elucidation of what "follows" (page 8). And he thus commences his exposition—"The Governor "is the President, and the first of a council of four members; the Commander-"in-Chief being the second; and two civil servants the third and fourth. "Resolutions are passed on the vote of the majority, the Governor having a "casting vote. These usually take the form of minutes. IN ALL CASES "THE INITIATIVE IS WITH THE GOVERNOR. He either prepares his own "minutes, OR *they are brought to him in draft for his consideration by the "Secretary of the department, either in his hand-writing, or copied in his "office from his rough drafts.* THE LATTER IS THE USUAL PROCESS IN ALL "EXCEPT CASES OF EXTRAORDINARY IMPORTANCE, OR CASES IN WHICH A "GOVERNOR HIMSELF POSSESSES THAT INDIAN OR PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE "WHICH ENABLES HIM TO PROPOSE MEASURES WITHOUT CONSULTATION WITH "ANY OTHER PARTY. From these minutes, if concurred in by a majority "of the Board, orders are promulgated, &c." It is a notorious fact that Lord Falkland does not pretend to that "Indian knowledge which, &c." Mr. Reid has himself told us ("Letter," p. 34) that far from these cases

In the next Chapter will be found the narration of certain circumstances which tended powerfully to increase the belief of the natives that the continuance of the guarantee to the bank under Baba Nafra's control, and the Government vindication of Nursoo Punt, were mainly due to the corrupt influence of Mr. Reid. In this place it is only necessary to observe, that, having before him the anticipatory exculpation of Nursoo, to which his signature had been obtained on the 7th of October, and the *practically* complete exoneration contained in Mr. Reid's minute of the 20th November, it ought not to excite surprise that Lord Falkland accepted as valid the elaborate vindication which Mr. Reid caused to be submitted to him on or before the 28th December. It is in nowise wonderful, that the impressions regarding Nursoo's guilt entertained by a nobleman who was more than justified in allowing himself to be guided by those who possessed that Indian experience to which he felt it would be absurd in him to prefer any

---

being of "extraordinary importance," my Reports "AT ONCE SHOWED HIM THAT THE AFFAIR WAS ONE OF A VERY ORDINARY NATURE." Yet he offers no explanation of the fact that, in respect of at least one of my two reports affecting Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra, the USUAL PROCESS WAS departed from, and the "initiative" practically taken out of the hands of the Governor and Mr. Secretary Malet, and transferred to Mr. Reid, whose draft, "written as for himself," was submitted to the Governor. This singular subversion of the routine system, as laid down by Mr. Reid, was the more remarkable, inasmuch as he informs us, at page 7, that "in the political "affairs of Guzerat he never took the least interest, until his accession to "council obliged him to consider those which came before him." The "political affairs of Guzerat," it is not unnecessary to explain, were almost wholly of the character of those discussed in my Reports,---they were the miscellaneous questions (frequently involving charges against corrupt servants) which, occurring in the offices of the Resident and political agents of that province, were submitted for the consideration of Government). And these (the political affairs of Guzerat) Mr. Reid tells us (page 7) "THROUGHOUT HIS WHOLE CAREER AS SECRETARY AND MEMBER OF THE "GOVERNMENT, *were conducted, under the Governors and their Councils*, BY "MR. WILLOUGHBY." To those who have done me the honor of following me thus far, it will occasion no surprise to be informed, at page 10, Mr. Reid recollecting that this is a mistake, admits that at one time (and that the most important portion of the period to which Mr. Reid had been referring) Mr. Willoughby had been "specially permitted to hold himself aloof from the disposal of those cases." This, however, is a topic that will be more fully discussed in a subsequent Chapter.

claims, should have given way before the opinions of his "civil colleagues," and, "ESPECIALLY THE COGENT ARGUMENTS OF THE HONOURABLE MR. REID!" And as little wonderful is it that his Lordship should have agreed to inform my *locum tenens* that it was quite "UNNECESSARY TO REQUIRE HIS (Nursoo Punt's) EXPLANATIONS ON A SINGLE POINT IN THESE TRANSACTIONS! For if Mr. Reid's defences were valid in any manner or degree, there seemed reason to believe that they were valid in all respects.*

* Of the many incomprehensible matters connected with the proceedings of the Bombay Government, as detailed in the Baroda Blue Books, one of the most difficult to be understood is the circumstances under which, and the objects for which, Lord Falkland's signature was obtained to the minute of the 7th October. This minute, Mr. Malet informs us (in the second of the "two memorandums" which he wrote on the 22nd of January, 1852, to be found respectively at pages 1044 and 1082) "was no doubt purposely de-"tained in circulation until the decision on the charges against Nursoo Punt "on the Gorajee Pol case had been disposed of; AS UNTIL THAT WAS DECIDED, "IT WAS NOT CERTAIN THAT THE MINUTE ON THE PETITION WOULD STAND;" —a form of words which seems to imply that the minute written before Lord Falkland and Mr. Willoughby had ascertained its justice, was kept in circulation to carry its own weight with it, till it was seen whether Mr. Reid's "*cogent arguments*" would induce Lord Falkland to adopt in detail, on the 28th December, a vindication to which he had, in ignorance of the merits of the case, antecedently committed himself in the gross, on the 7th of October.

In reference to this subject, there is one point to which I would solicit the reader's attention. Though Mr. Frere could not legally convict Nursoo Punt of having received the bribe of £28,000 from Baba Nafra, on the 19th or 20th of October, 1848,—"*the case from the first being hardly capable of "judicial proof*,"—the "*strongest suspicions*" were left on the Commissioner's mind, that "*the money was paid to Nursoo Punt*, AND THAT HE HAD IMPOR-"TUNED BABA NAFRA ON TWO OCCASIONS FOR IT." It may readily be supposed that the one rogue should have wished to break his compact with the other, *when the approaching departure of Nursoo threatened to incapacitate him from rendering those services for which the money had been promised.* We shall hereafter find that there were those in Bombay, who sent Nursoo most authentic intelligence of the proceedings of Government affecting himself. And if we suppose (and the hypothesis is no violent one) that Nursoo received a copy of the mysterious minute of the 7th of October, which *could not* have reached him before the 10th, and probably did not reach him for some days after, *we can easily understand why Baba Nafra should, on the 19th or 20th have implimented the compact, for which he had been twice vainly importuned.* Whatever was the origin of the Minute, or whatever the view with which it was written, there is every reason to believe that it was a GOD-SEND to Nursoo, and as such, could hardly fail to strengthen, if not the popular belief, at least the belief of the Bank people, in Nursoo's influence at Bombay.

CHAPTER IV.

THE IGNORED PETITION.

Before I proceed to detail some of the circumstances which I officially reported to the Bombay Government, as having more especially tended to satisfy the natives that Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra enjoyed the corrupt friendship of the senior member of Lord Falkland's council, I would request the reader to ponder, for a few brief moments, on the facts and considerations adverted to in the preceding Chapters. I would beg him to recollect that the natives of Baroda had, for a succession of years, been firmly convinced of the corruptibility of the highest Bombay functionaries.* I would remind him that they were thoroughly acquainted with the character and career of Baba Nafra; with the disgraceful nature of his alliance with Nursoo Punt; and with the terrible and unredressed wrongs which, as the result of this alliance, Joitœbhae and his other victims had been doomed to sustain during my absence in Egypt—wrongs which, though sneered at by Mr. Reid, are admitted to have been alike fearful and lamentable, as well by the Bombay Government as by the Court of Directors, and to have been due to the corrupt conduct of Nursoo Punt—after he had been thrust back, through Mr. Reid's intervention, into the post which he had previously betrayed.

---

* For a few of the reasons assigned by the men of Guzerat for this belief, *vide* the earlier portion of my "Khutput Report" (BB. pp. 1340 to 1379): or the summaries given by "Indus." ("Bombay Briberies."—Effingham Wilson, 11, Royal Exchange;) and by Mr. Chapman. ("Baroda *and* Bombay, their Political Morality."—John Chapman, 142, Strand.)

Due consideration having been given to these points, I would request the reader's attention to the fact stated in my Khutput Report (BB. p. 1408), that—

"Though on the 25th November,* 1848, Government received a petition from Baroda, in which Nursoo Punt was accused of having openly boasted of the impunity which he and his friends enjoyed through Mr. Reid's favor; this petition was not sent to the acting Resident to have the authenticity of its allegations investigated, until the day after that on which Government had forwarded its invitation to Nursoo to remain at the head of the native department of my own office—an invitation which implied that the charges I had made against him were quite unfounded, and which thus involved a heavy censure on myself, and the most unmitigated manifestation of its displeasure in the power of Government to display.† And (I continued) in estimating the effect on the native mind of the detention of the petition, it should be remembered that twenty days after it had been in the possession of Government, and twenty days before it was sent to Captain French, Government had (15th December, 1848) communicated to that officer its decision in the Govind Row Guicowar case, *which took no notice of the charge of constructive forgery brought against Baba Nafra, whom, as alleged in the petition, Nursoo boasted of screening in other matters, through the agency of Mr. Reid.*"‡

I subjoin portions of the petition; and the reader will, I think, admit that I by no means exaggerated the real state of the case, when, on the 10th of April, 1851, I officially recorded my belief, that the allegations of the petition, when viewed in connexion with

* By a misprint given as the 5th (for 25th). Mr. Frere declares the petition to have been received in Bombay on the 20th.

† "Both the letter permitting Nursoo Punt to withdraw his application, "and that forwarding the petition against him, bear date the 4th January "(1849); but the office register proves that while the former was despatched "so as to reach Baroda on the 8th, the latter did not arrive till the 9th." Such is the note appended to the above quotation in my Khutput Report (BB. p. 1408.)

‡ The "constructive forgery" alluded to, was the substitution of one bond for another, discussed in the preceding Chapter. To Mr. Reid's declaration, that the Bank had been guilty of "NO FORGERIES," is probably due the introduction of the term. In my early appeal against the decision of Government, I described the substitution as an act "*morally, if not legally, equivalent to forgery.*" And afterwards, not being a lawyer, I ventured to characterize it as "constructive forgery."

the entire proceedings of Government, and with the popular conviction in the corruptibility of high functionaries, afforded the natives of Baroda ground for believing that "some influence had "been exerted to keep it (the petition) back till Government "had, by its censure on myself, and its compliment to Nursoo, "effectually deterred the author from avowing himself, and thus "placed the native agent in the position of a deeply injured and "cruelly maligned man." (BB. p. 1060.)

"About two months ago, Colonel Outram discovered some rogueries of his (Nursoo Punt's) treacherous acts; and he, being afraid that all would come to light and prove his ruin, begged pardon, and applied for a pension. This rejoiced all the people of Baroda, except a few who gave him bribes, and got him to do their business. However, he NOW openly says '*I have the* '*support of Mr. Reid the Councillor.* I HAVE FORWARDED TO HIM A PETITION, 'WITH A MEMORANDUM OF KULLUMBUNDEE, &c., (paragraphs of instructions, 'or information). As my friendship with him is of a secret nature, he will 'protect me from the consequences of my crime. Even Outram's father 'cannot injure me. What can others do then? *I shall apply for a pension* '*whenever I like;* no one can read the further representations of those I have 'injured. Although the charge of murder was proved against Baba Nafra, 'I did not allow a hair of his head to be injured. On the contrary, I have 'made the widow of Hurree Bhugtee (the unhappy Joitœbhae) go about 'begging. IN LIKE MANNER I WILL RUIN THE PERSONS WHO HAVE BEEN 'REJOICED BY THE HOPE OF MY LEAVING THIS SITUATION. Gunnesh Punt and 'Baba Nafra are my relatives, and consequently I have full means (to work) 'with the Guicowar Government. Therefore I am not afraid of anything, 'I shall spend as much money as may be necessary to secure the assistance 'of European gentlemen in Bombay. AND I SHALL CONTINUE TO HOLD THIS 'SITUATION.' These proceedings of his have frightened the people. I am fully confident that Mr. Reid will not stain his character for uprightness, known throughout India, by supporting such a corrupt man. *I beg to assure Government that if this native agent be suspended from office, and an enquiry instituted, his fraudulent and corrupt conduct will be proved.*"

It now appears—from an explanation given by Mr. Secretary Malet, in a "memorandum" dated 22nd January, 1852 (BB. p. 1044)—that, owing to some peculiarly unfortunate "arrears of business at that time existing" in the Persian department, whither the petition was sent on the 25th November, 1848, to be rendered into English, the "translation," as it is called in one of Mr. Malet's

"memoranda," or the "translated substance" as it is styled in another, could not be sent back to the political department till the 20th of December. Mr. Malet informs us that this translation was put into "circulation" next day; but he does not say, what Mr. Reid unhesitatingly affirms apparently on no better grounds than his personal recollections, (page 35)—that it was submitted to the GOVERNOR on the 21st December. And but for the declaration of Mr. Reid—implied rather than asserted—in the same page, that he himself did *not* see the document till the 28th or 29th December, I should have arrived at a different conclusion. I should have thought it most probable that Mr. Malet had sent the translated petition in the first instance to Mr. Reid, not only because it made mention of that gentleman's name, but because (by his own account) Mr. Reid had, in the disposal of the charges against Nursoo Punt, superseded the functions both of Lord Falkland and Mr. Malet, by writing the most important of those "*drafts*" which, as we learn from himself (at page 5), but for an inversion in this particular case of the "usual process," it would have fallen to the Secretary to prepare.

"The Governor,"—writes Mr. Reid, p. 38—"minuted on it (the petition) on the 28th December—the date of his minute on Colonel Outram's letter of the 7th September, 1848. It must have reached me on the same or the next day, *and have been passed* AT ONCE *to Mr. Willoughby*; FOR HIS MINUTE *is dated the* 31*st December*, 1848."—P. 30.

I confess my inability to appreciate the syllogism here propounded. But admitting its cogency, I can only express my regret that Mr. Reid should, in 1848, have so lightly treated such a document as to "*pass it on at once*;" and my still deeper regret that, in 1853, he should, by denying, compel me to repeat that, (giving all due weight to the "arrears of business at that time existing in the Persian department,") the manner in which this petition was treated tended powerfully to increase the belief in his own corruptibility, entertained by the natives of Baroda.

It is true, as Mr. Reid tells us, that the "minute" in the case of Ghorajee Pol, was signed by Lord Falkland on the 28th of December—the day on which his Lordship's signature was

obtained to the minute on the petition under notice. But it is no less true that, according to Mr. Reid's own admission, (p. 30) the former of these minutes was a triumph of his own pen. And even if we assume that the second minute had not, like its predecessor, been originally written by Mr. Reid, "*as if for himself*," the natives of Baroda, (whose corrupt intercourse with the secretariat, as Mr. Reid admits,) cannot have failed to know that he "concurred" in it; in other words, that he wished the petition in which his own name was so specifically mentioned, to be slurred over, *in a manner contrary to official precedent and usage!*

"THE USUAL MODE of disposing of petitions," writes Mr. Malet, (B.B. p. 1047)—"is to send them for OPINION AND REPORT." *This petition, however, was simply sent to Captain French "that he "might discover whether it was a bona fide petition from*—A PERSON!"—"It will be observed"—continues Mr. Malet, in the same "memorandum," elicited by Mr. Commissioner Frere's comments on what he designated "*an unhappy concatenation of circumstances*"—"that the difference in the order, on this occasion, is quite sufficient to show that it was considered pseudonymous, *and that the unsupported accusations* it might contain, *could not affect any decision of Government* ON OTHER MATTERS, *while the date of its receipt from the Persian Secretary's office, was five days subsequent to the communication to the Resident, of the decision on Hurree Bughtee's case, issued on the* 15*th December.*"

The precise bearing on Mr. Frere's strictures of the latter portion of Mr. Malet's remarks is not very obvious. Mr. Frere had simply drawn attention to the fact, that "*the petition was received "in Bombay on the* 20*th November; but that no notice appears "to have been taken of it till the* 4*th of January following, when "it is sent to the Resident, to enquire whether it be genuine,* AND IS "ACCOMPANIED BY ANOTHER LETTER PERMITTING THE RESIDENT TO "RETAIN THE ACCUSED PERSON IN HIS SITUATION."—Mr. Frere, no more than myself, accused Mr. Reid, or any other member of Government, of corrupt practices. On the contrary, like myself, he declared that no doubt could be entertained by their European officers, of their perfect integrity. Like myself, Mr. Frere was

ignorant of the very unfortunate arrears of business in the Persian department, which had caused this short but not unimportant petition to be detained from "circulation" for such a length of time. And, like myself—and I will be bound to add, like the natives—he never, for a moment, expected or desired that "the *unsupported accusations*" against Nursoo, contained in this or any other petition, should be allowed "*to influence the decisions of Government* IN OTHER CASES!" He simply intimated to Government, that the natives, pondering on a long and "unhappy concatenation of circumstances," *reasoned* on the FACT, that no notice had been taken of this petition for forty-nine days, according to his opinion, and for forty according to Mr. Malet's and my own account, after it had reached Bombay; that when eventually sent, it was, contrary to all usage, sent *not* for investigation into the truth of its allegations, but that Captain French might ascertain whether its signature was that of "a person;" and that it was accompanied by a letter calculated to deter the author from avowing himself.*

In reference to Mr. Malet's observations in January, 1852, that "the difference (from usage) in the order on this occasion, is "quite sufficient to show that the petition was considered pseu-"donymous," I beg to subjoin the following remarks forwarded by me to Government in April, 1851:—

"The petition from which the above extracts are taken bore a fictitious "signature. But though this may have been suspected, *inasmuch as natives* "*very rarely give their names in such cases, till they see that the authorities* "*are likely to take up the case in earnest*, Government could not have known

* What made the matter worse in native estimation, or, at all events, was calculated to do so, was the fact, that though the invitation given to Nursoo to retain his appointment was dated the 4th January, the letter containing the "*cogent arguments*" of Mr. Reid was only dated the 12th. Thus, Capt. French was aware of the practical exoneration, and more than exoneration, of Nursoo, on the 8th January—while he could not form any opinion on the cogency of Mr. Reid's arguments till the 16th—not until nine days after the first letter had been acted on. And *then* he was not very likely to go over a wearisome case to ascertain whether he had done wisely in inviting Nursoo to remain.

" that such was positively the case, when it ignored the petition—*till after* " *Nursoo's honorable acquittal.* AND EVEN HAD GOVERNMENT BEEN DULY " APPRIZED THAT THE SIGNATURE OF THE PETITION WAS A FICTITIOUS ONE, " THIS CIRCUMSTANCE WOULD NOT, IN NATIVE ESTIMATION, HAVE AFFECTED " THE CASE. *For it is not at all unusual to investigate charges conveyed in* " *anonymous or fictitious petitions.* The petitioner had volunteered to sub- " stantiate all his allegations, were Nursoo Punt suspended from office; that " he really intended to do so is apparent from his having come forward " when Nursoo had ceased to be native agent; *and while Nursoo remained in* " *power, he might well have dreaded the wrath of that individual, and of his* " *powerful and corrupt friends, both in the City and in the Durbar.*" BB. p. 1060.

These remarks I re-produced in my Khutput Report, forwarded to Government in October, 1851. And in a note, I drew the attention of Government to the fact that a very different plan had been pursued in 1846, when a pseudonymous petition in the native character was received, containing accusations against the Fudkey, who (as the Court of Directors have not hesitated to express their opinion) had incurred the bitter hostility of the entire gang of Baroda corruptionists on account of the valuable services he had rendered in the detection of roguery. I reminded the Government that, on that occasion, ere the petition had been ten days in the Secretariat, it was sent for "REPORT" to Mr. Andrews (the officiating Resident), by whom its allegations were carefully investigated.* While, to enable him to determine whether the signature of the petition against Nursoo was that of "*a person*," Captain French was of course compelled to apply to NURSOO HIMSELF; or at least to one of the members of that native establishment over which Nursoo had been invited to continue to preside. And, under these circumstances, as I reported to Government, it is not very wonderful that in twenty-four hours the acting Resident was enabled to report that out of an immense population, there was no one bearing the petitioner's name.

At page 39 of his "Letter" Mr. Reid falls into the singular mistake of saying of the petition that "*its very substance* AT ONCE *proclaimed it to be fictitious*—AS IT FINALLY PROVED TO BE."

Its very substance proved it to be truthful. At all events, as

* And found to be untrue.

I officially reported to Government, "*its allegations bore on their surface a strong air of verisimilitude.*"

The petitioner was fully aware of Nursoo's character. He was aware that, ceasing to repose confidence in Nursoo, I had called in other aid. He was aware, to use his own words, that I had "discovered some of Nursoo's treacherous acts." He was aware that Nursoo had sent in his application for permission to retire on his pension. And the last idea that was likely to have spontaneously occurred to him, was, that the man whose pension ought in strict fairness to have been withheld, would, *contrary to all usage*, be invited to recall his resignation. Yet his petition was avowedly, and as the context shows, exclusively, inspired by the alarm created in his own mind, and in the minds of others, lest Nursoo might possibly, through the "*secret friendship*" of Mr. Reid, be permitted to recall his resignation. From whom but Nursoo was such a suggestion likely to have come? Again, though Nursoo had not at that time withdrawn his resignation, or expressed to GOVERNMENT the slightest hint of a wish to recall it, *he* HAD *in a most irregular manner, sent in a petition. This petition, however, not only Nursoo, but the Government, had kept from Mr. Battye and myself;* NOT A TRACE OF IT REMAINED ON THE RESIDENCY RECORDS. How then was the petitioner to know of its existence unless Nursoo had vaunted of it? The allegations of the petitioner, as to the relationship subsisting between Nursoo and two of the leading Baroda corruptionists, were consistent with the official report of Mr. Remington, on which, in May, 1844, Mr. Reid had himself concurred with Sir George Arthur in recording a minute. A slight exercise of memory would have enabled Mr. Reid to recollect that Nursoo *had*, as the petitioner mentioned (in a part of his petition not quoted) made a considerable pecuniary sacrifice when he left the revenue for the political department; though only half of what the petitioner imagined. And Mr. Reid could hardly have forgotten that when, in 1843, Nursoo did seek to make this sacrifice, he himself "*and many others*" had warned him of the risk he ran of becoming "CONTAMINATED BY A RESIDENCE IN SUCH A SINK OF VILLAINY."

As regards Mr. Reid's assertion that the substance of the petition has been proved to be fictitious, I have only to oppose the judicial results arrived at by Mr. Frere. In reference to his declaration of readiness to "join issue with Colonel Outram on the subject of anonymous petitions," I have to observe, that this petition was *not* anonymous—that there was nothing (beyond the well-known native usage) to justify the belief that it was even pseudonymous. I would further remind him, in the words of his able and clear-headed critic INDUS, that though he *may* have "always contended that anonymous petitions ought to be treated with contempt," "*the question is, not what Mr. Reid has always contended, but what has always been the practice of the* (*Bombay*) *Government.*"* And I would suggest to him the propriety of explaining what steps he took, in 1846, to mark his "contempt" for the pseudonymous petition against the Fudkey, which was sent to Baroda within ten days after its receipt;—and sent, not that it might be ascertained whether its signature was that of "A PERSON," but *whether its allegations could be substantiated.*

At page 40 of his "Letter," Mr. Reid writes:

"So far as the petition concerned me personally, I deemed it utterly unworthy of notice; notwithstanding the just appreciation of my character at which the writer had arrived. I placed no faith in anything it contained as to Nursoo Punt's sayings and doings, and their effect at Baroda. I believed, and still believe, the whole to be a complete fabrication, and to have its origin, if not in Furké himself, at least in one of his faction."

"Mr. Reid will "not stain his "character for up- "rightness, known "throughout In- "dia.—Page 951. —Fas est et ab hoste doceri.

Mr. Reid can of course best tell, what he deemed worthy, and what unworthy, of his notice as member of a government held in the slender moral estimation indicated by the Dhackjee Dadajee

* *Vide* p. 47 of the fourth edition of "Bombay Briberies, a Tale of the "Present Charter, by Indus, greatly enlarged, and containing the Author's "Reply to Mr. Lestock Robert Reid, together with a Suppressed Dispatch "from Colonel Outram. London: Effingham Wilson; 11, Royal Ex- "change."

conspiracy, and by the letters which he and Mr. Willoughby had received in April, 1848, intimating, that it would be for their interest to give a decision in favor of the bank conducted by Baba Nafra. He, too, must be allowed to be the best judge of the value of the formal declarations of confidence in his integrity, made by a man whose petition evinced intense apprehension lest, through Mr. Reid's "secret friendship," Nursoo Punt should, in defiance of right and decency, be permitted to remain in the post he had so long betrayed. And as Mr. Reid *does*, apparently, attach very considerable importance to this testimonial, from one whose representations he declares to be "unworthy of notice," I deem it but fair to quote another passage in which (p. 62) he endeavours to turn it to good account.

"Our characters will, I trust, defend us from any imputation of criminality because natives are corrupt; and we must be content with lamenting that our purity could not protect us from the belief, even among the dupes of the corruptionists at Baroda, that any English gentlemen holding the high positions that we did, could be corrupt. I will quote one sentence from Colonel Outram's favorite anonymous petition, which, so far as I am concerned, SHOWS that my name did not always stand low in that sink of iniquity. 'Mr. Reid will not stain his character for uprightness, known throughout India, &c., &c.'"

I do not pretend to blame Mr. Reid for refusing to place any "faith" in the allegations which the petitioner made in reference to Nursoo Punt—or for believing that the whole was a "fabrication." Nor do I mean to insinuate that the members of Government did not act conscientiously on this as well as on all other occasions, in which I thought myself bound to tender a respectful appeal against their measures. But I DO repeat that the proceedings of Government consequent on, or in harmony with, these mental conditions on Mr. Reid's part, DID tend very powerfully to meet the popular belief in his own corruptibility."

At page 40 Mr. Reid thus prosecutes his argument—

Vide page 31 of this letter.*

"I have explained above, that on the 7th October, 1848, the Governor had recorded an opinion, that Nursoo Punt should be allowed to withdraw his resignation (though this was not communicated to the acting Resident

until the cases of Govindrao Guikwar and Guorojee Pol were disposed of), and that, in his minute of the 20th November 1848, the Governor had referred to his civil colleagues the question of withdrawing the guarantee from Hurree Bhugtee's firm. This minute, doubtless, had been copied in the Secretary's office, after its preparation by the Chief Secretary; so that there was ample time, and ample matter, before the accomplice in the secretariat, who communicated all that transpired in the department to Baroda, to enable the petitioner to frame and dispatch his petition, having for its object to poison my mind, and those of my colleagues, against Nursoo Punt; and to induce us to recommend the withdrawal of the guarantee from the firm."

Vide page 27 of this letter.*

The confusion into which Mr. Reid's mind has been thrown by the Pamphlet of Indus is well illustrated in the foregoing passage.

In the first place the argument based on the ignored petition with which the natives of Baroda justified their belief in Mr. Reid's corruptibility, was derived from the fact that though the petition was, according to Mr. Reid himself, received in Bombay on the 25th November, 1848, no notice was taken of it until, on the 4th of January, 1849, measures had been adopted, the tendency of which was to deter the writer from coming forward. And this argument is in no manner or degree affected by any speculations regarding the motives of the petitioner. But even if it were, Mr. Reid goes somewhat out of his way in search of an hypothesis, when he assumes that the real motive of the writer was less (what the whole context of the petition proves it to have been) to prevent Nursoo's boastful predictions being fulfilled, than to induce the Government to withdraw the guarantee from the Hurree Bhugtee bank. If, as Mr. Reid says, the petitioner *had* received intelligence of the contents of the minute of the 20th November, which Mr. Malet drafted for Lord Falkland, he would have seen that at that date the annulment of the guarantee seemed extremely probable, without his interfering in the matter. And a less skilful calculator than Mr. Reid might have discovered, that even if the petitioner had written immediately on the receipt of the assumed

* The references are Mr. Reid's, and are made by him to his own "Letter."

communication from Bombay, that communication must have been made to him on the 18th of November, at the very latest, to enable the petition to reach Bombay on the 25th. If we adopt the judicially-recorded opinion arrived at by Mr. Frere, that the petition was received in Bombay on the 20th November, we must assume that Lord Falkland's minute of that day must have reached the petitioner on the 13th! For in the cold season letters passing from Bombay to Baroda, and *vice versa*, do not reach their destination till the fourth and fifth days. Further, Mr. Reid might, on reflection, have discovered the improbability of an hypothesis which assumed that the corrupt and lucre-seeking clerks of the secretariat, proved to be in alliance with Baba Nafra, Bhow Tambekur, and other of Nursoo's friends, should have volunteered information to a poor man, as the petitioner was,—and one opposed to the men to whom their corrupt services had been sold. And whether Mr. Reid perceives it or not, the reader will not fail to recognise the fact, that even if his untenable hypotheses were correct, it is perfectly irrelevant to the point which he professes to elucidate—viz., the reason why, contrary to usage, no steps were taken to test the accuracy of the petition, and why it was altogether ignored till after measures had been adopted to deter the author from avowing himself. Mr. Reid will hardly pretend that he was, in December 1848, aware of the treachery of the secretariat clerks. If he was so—then why was the official exposure of the scandalous system left to be achieved by myself in 1851? If he was not—then what is the value of the ingenious hypotheses he indulges in?

In continuation of the passage in which these hypotheses are promulgated, Mr. Reid says:—

"The story told in this petition of Nursoo Punt's having sent me 'a memorandum of Kulmbundee, &c.,' is utterly false. I do not recollect having had, throughout the whole of these proceedings, the slightest correspondence with, or communication from him, either directly or indirectly; and it is my belief, that a short note which Mr. Williamson Ramsay recently (on the 29th December 1852, delivered to me from him,—in which he briefly tells me that he has forwarded a memorial to the Hon. Court of Directors (which, however, I have not seen),—is the first letter I have received from him,

since I committed the unpardonable offence (in his rival Furkè's eyes) of preventing his being driven from his office unjustly. Writing, as I do, on a matter which occurred more than four years ago—which then I deemed one of the most ordinary nature—and which has now only acquired an importance by being mixed up in discussions fomented, if not created, by *disappointed ambition*, *wounded vanity*, *inordinate self-opinion*, honest though perverted views, and other motives—some good, some bad, as the part of each agent in them is considered—I may be liable to error, and I must claim a latitude in my disavowments. Indeed, had I seen Nursoo Punt, or any one interested in him, after I had made up my mind that in the only two accusatory letters which I had seen from Col. Outram, there were no just causes of complaint established against him, I should not have had the least hesitation in mentioning to him my opinion. There was, then, no particular call for secrecy; and I cannot doubt, therefore, that whether from my minutes, or from what might have fallen from me in conversation, my sentiments were not long concealed."—p.p. 41 and 42.

Mr. Reid's simple assertion is quite enough to establish any point in which he has not the misfortune to contradict himself in official documents. His straight-forward and unqualified denial of having received the "memorandum of Kullumbundee," which Nursoo boasted of having sent to him, along with the petition of the 18th September, completely disposes of that allegation made by the corrupt native agent. And it is a pity, therefore, that he should, in some degree, have weakened the effect of this denial by his subsequent amplifications. For the "memorandum" referred to, was alleged to have been written *prior to*, and not "*since* Mr. Reid committed the unpardonable, &c. &c." That gentleman does not deny that (as the petitioner represented Nursoo to have boasted) the petition was sent to himself for submittal to Government. And it seems strange, that aware of this fact—aware that no official record of it existed—he should at once have rejected as "*unworthy of notice*," a document which, by supplying *prima facie* evidence that the petitioner *had* received certain communications from Nursoo, afforded presumption that his allusion to the private "*memorandum*" was at least based on some of Nursoo's expressions.

In continuation of the remarks above quoted, Mr. Reid thus proceeds at page 42;—

"The mention in this petition of Baba Nafra and Hurree Bughtee's widow, is, I may observe, in advance of Colonel Outram's information at that time; for until after his return from Egypt, long after I left India, he never informed Government that he had any suspicion of any grievous wrong having been inflicted on this lady; and if this case (Joitabhae's) was not previously brought in a proper manner before the Government, Colonel Outram himself is to blame."

Mr. Reid is right. The allusions in the petition to what Colonel Sykes so truly characterizes as "*the atrocious proceedings in the widow Joitabhae's case,*" were very considerably in advance of "my information at that time." But as Mr. Reid might have been aware, if he had read my report on that case,—and he ought to have read it, before in this and in another passage already referred to, he ventured to offer opinions on it—the petitioner's allusions were subsequently proved to be only too true. Such being the case, it will, I hope, occur to Mr. Reid, when preparing a second edition of his Pamphlet, that the fact which he cites, as if it tended to better his case, serves only to damage the irrelevant arguments which he has brought to bear on the subject of the petition. And his Pamphlet would lose neither in moral dignity or logical value, if, in his second edition, he were to venture on a small act of justice. He might examine the allusions to the case of Joitœbhae, which appear in more than one part of his "Letter" by the light —I wont say of my own Report, but—of the Dispatch from the Court of Directors, in reference to that Report, which he will find at page 9 of the Baroda Blue Book. If he does so, he will discover that the Honourable body into which he himself now seeks admission, far from admitting that "Colonel Outram is himself to blame" for any of Joitabhae's sufferings, declare that "the ultimate success of the investigations instituted with a view to the redressal of her wrongs," "*is wholly attributable to that officer's exertions.*" And if, in prosecuting his researches, he will turn to page 18 of the same Blue Book, he will discover that the Honourable Court determine, that for those measures which "*enabled the persecuters of Joitœbhae to commit gross injustice*"—the principal blame is due to Nursoo Punt, who owing to the "*cogent argu-*

ments" of Mr. Reid, was thrust back into the post he had betrayed, and of whom the Court observe that "*there is ample ground of moral conviction that* (when thus thrust back) *he misinformed Captain French, as he has been clearly proved to have misinformed Lieutenant Colonel Outram.*"

From page 42 to page 45 Mr. Reid gives what he calls the subsequent history of the petition under notice. His ostensible object is to prove that the man who came forward to avow the authorship of the petition in September 1850,—after Nursoo had exchanged the Baroda Native Agency for the post of Dufturdar in the office of the Ahmedabad collector—was unworthy of credence. But the propositions which he seems most desirous of establishing, or rather of *hinting* in such a manner that they shall be at once accepted by his readers, are

1st—That, either from mental imbecility or moral obliquity, I was induced to accept, if not actually to suborn and dictate, evidence designed to prove that Nursoo had made use of the expressions attributed to him in the ignored petition.

2nd—That the Fudkey (a man who, as will be hereafter seen, I did not even admit to the Residency) and his friends (amongst whom Mr. Reid classes Nursoo's successor, who entertained very unfriendly feelings towards the Fudkey) had "*little difficulty in inducing me to believe anything.*"

3rd—That "all my other investigations,"—"if carried on in a similar spirit," are not be "depended on."

But for the extraordinary confusion which his present position seems to have created in Mr. Reid's mind, he might have perceived that, even were his assertions and insinuations as unassailable as they are easy of refutation, the fact would not be in the slightest degree relevant to the question, of which he professes to dispose. That question is; whether I was justified in reporting that the manner in which the petition had been treated, in November and December 1848, and in January 1849, was calculated to confirm the persuasion of Mr. Reid's corruptibility which prevailed amongst the natives at Baroda. And the question can-

hardly be affected by the validity, or otherwise, of examinations held in September, 1850.

Mr. Frere, a gentleman whose name, in respect either of talent or uprightness, does not stand second even to that of Mr. Reid—whose judicial experience is considerably greater than that of which Mr. Reid can boast—and who carried on an entirely independent enquiry into the subjects adverted to, arrived at a conclusion regarding the value of the result of my "investigations," and the actual nature of the points investigated, very different from that *implied* by Mr. Reid.

Mr. Frere's conclusions have received the almost unqualified assent of the Board of Control, and the Court of Directors; and these bodies have pronounced my own investigations which Mr. Reid is so anxious to disparage, to have been in themselves "important," and to have been carried out with "zeal, energy, ability, and success."

As Mr. Reid's insinuations are all *inferentially* implied in the course of a brief but inaccurate account of certain examinations held by me in 1850, they are not susceptible of direct disproof. I beg, however, to give them an emphatic contradiction. And to enable the reader to determine whether more credit is due to Mr. Reid's insinuations, or my repudiation of them, I subjoin a few illustrations of the fairness of my assailant.

In September 1850, I handed to Government, "for such notice as might be deemed necessary," certain depositions, tending to show that "Nursoo Punt, late Native Agent, had been in the habit of taking most unwarrantable liberty with the name of a late member of council." These depositions had been given by the writer of the petition which has just been discussed—by the four men who were present when Nursoo made his prediction, that through Mr. Reid's influence he would be permitted to remain in the post which he had betrayed—and by the Peons, who had summoned these witnesses. In forwarding these documents, I observed:—

"From the circumstance of this person, Jeyrow Hyputrow, having appended a fictitious name to his petition—bearing a notoriously bad character

—and even avowing enmity to the late Native Agent, I should not have regarded the representations in his petition as worthy of a moment's consideration, had not they been borne out to a considerable extent by the evidence of the four persons who were present on the occasion of the dispute therein referred to, with whom it does not appear possible he could have collusion; *and had I not* OTHER CAUSES FOR BELIEVING *that most of what he has advanced is susceptible of proof?*" BB. p. 950.

But Mr. Reid complains that,—

"Colonel Outram *omitted* the fact (which was ascertained from other quarters, and which his informants must have known) that Jeyrow had been in the Government service; had been dismissed, and declared incapable of re-employment; and that since his dismissal, various other of his malpractices had been discovered."

It would have been no more than candid, had Mr. Reid mentioned that *the fact of the man's having been dismissed the Government service was stated in the face of the deposition.* He might have added, that the information which he says was obtained from other quarters, and which he implies that I withheld, was information which the records of my own office did not supply.* He might have taken the trouble to inform his readers, that the fact "ascertained from other quarters," was ascertained by Mr. Secretary Malet on a reference to the Government records, made in consequence of the information which the deposition afforded him. And he might have explained, what he knew to be the case, that all the light which Mr. Malet threw on the subject was that afforded by the following words:

"Jeyrow Hyputrow was dismissed from his appointment as Thaunadar of Jambooghora, on the 3rd April 1847, and was afterwards declared by Government incapable of re-employment. Subsequent to his dismissal, various other of his malpractices were discovered, as reported by Mr. Mansfield on the 10th December 1847." BB. p. 957.

It might have occurred to Mr. Reid, that the fact of my "informant"—that is, my new Native Agent—having brought to my notice that Jeyrow's character was bad, rather militated

* Jeyrow was a subordinate in the Rewakanta office; an office entirely independent of the Baroda Residency.

against the supposition that he wished to impress me with a false estimate of his trustworthiness. Mr. Reid would, moreover, have been fully justified in assuming that the Native Agent, who had been only a few weeks in Baroda, was dependent for local information on the clerks in my office. And as he was well aware that no less than four of these (and those among the most highly trusted) were subsequently dismissed for treachery, and collusion with the corruptionists, he would not have erred in supposing, that had they been in possession of anything specific to allege against the man, they would hardly have failed to mention it.

At page 43 Mr. Reid continues:

"On the 11th July 1850, Colonel Outram took this man's deposition; and—in answer to a question whether any one was present when Nursoo Punt had said that Mr. Reid, the councillor, was a friend of his, &c., he elicited the reply: 'There were four persons present, two Banians and two Brahmans, who live in Baroda. If I saw them I should recognize them.' No further inquiry was then made, and the man returned to his village. 'Two or three days after,' it seems to have been suggested to Colonel Outram (*a sufficient time having elapsed to enable Jeyrow and his friends to find out two Banians and two Brahmins, and tutor them to their purpose*), to resume the investigation; but being told that Jeyrow had left Baroda, and 'not wishing 'unnecessarily to harass the man,' the Resident deferred the enquiry, and we hear nothing more till the 31st August 1850, when Jeyrow again appeared upon the scene. He was again interrogated. He deposed that, having been a week previously at the Residency, on some other business, he had been told to produce his witnesses; that he then returned to his village, and on again coming back to Baroda, on the 29th August 1850, he 'saw two, whom he followed to ascertain their houses;' that he desired them to come to the Residency; that they declined; that he informed the native agent Soorujram, who, 'after informing the Resident,' gave him a peon, to whom he showed the houses of the two witnesses; that one, a Brahmin, came with them to the Residency; that the other, a Banian, promised to do so on the morrow; that he did not know the names of the witnesses, 'by seeing them only could I make them out;' that he knew the second Brahmin by sight, and also the second Banian, whose house he had found out."

Mr. Reid *might* have explained to his reader that Nursoo was in the habit of holding a kind of morning levee at his own house, at which he enacted the great man; that the petitioner attended

one of these levees, with a view to expedite some business he wished to have transacted; that having "angered Nursoo," he elicited from him his boastful, but too true prediction; and that the miscellaneous character of the attendants at Nursoo's levees afforded a plausible solution of the statement of Jeyrow, that, though not personally acquainted with the names of the men who were present when the irate Nursoo made his memorable prediction, he knew them perfectly well by sight, and could point them out in the street. Nor would it have derogated from the moral dignity of Mr. Reid's Pamphlet, if he had informed his reader that Mr. Frere, after carefully weighing, analysing, and collating the evidence before him, came to the conclusion that Jeyrow's allegations regarding Nursoo were true.

In explanation of my not having taken immediate steps to test the accuracy of Jeyrow's statement, made to me on the 11th July, Mr. Reid might have mentioned that my time was then completely occupied with the very important investigations into the case of Joitæbhae, which commenced on the 5th of July.* (BB., p. 372). And in explanation of its having occurred to me "*two or three days after*" to resume my enquiry, he might have stated, (what as we shall see he was fully aware of,) that I had, *on the 12th of July*, discovered that Baba Nafra had sent an agent with a large sum or money to Bombay, in October or November, 1848—the very time that Nursoo was accused of having made an improper use of Mr. Reid's name.† (BB., p. 1216).

---

* Jeyrow having come to my office on business, on the 16th July entered into conversation with my native agent. The conversation having turned on certain revelations recently made respecting Joitæbhae's persecutions, Jeyrow observed that he had, in November 1848, forwarded in a petition on the subject of Nursoo's complicity with Baba Nafra, of which no notice had been taken; he was asked if he would repeat the statement to myself. He expressed his readiness to do so, and made the deposition recorded at page 951 of the Baroda Blue Book.

† As has been explained at page 16, there was a mistake in the year, which proved to be 1847. This was the mission for bribery purposes of which Mr. Frere determined that Nursoo was cognizant.

Mr. Reid, however, has not seen fit to mention these and many other of the circumstances of the case, and has therefore imposed on me the necessity of offering a few additional explanations. And first I would observe, that, though I thought it my duty, under the circumstances, to ascertain how far Jeyrow's allegation, that Nursoo had boasted of his being in possession of funds to secure the services of "English gentlemen," was true; and if true, how far it tallied with this mission of Nafra's, I was not very solicitous on the subject. On being told that Jeyrow had gone to his village—some twenty miles off—I simply directed that when he again came to the office, he should be desired to search out, and bring to the Residency, the men whom he declared to have been present when Nursoo's boasts were made. In about a week, that is about the 18th of July, Jeyrow came back to the office, when the native agent communicated my instructions to him. But so far from imperative were these instructions, that Jeyrow, having on his return to the city of Baroda, received an announcement that his nephew had been removed from the appointment he held at Borsad, hastened off to that village, where he remained till the 29th of July. On his return (such was his story) he went through the bazaars in search of the men. He succeeded in finding two of them. These he followed till he ascertained their abodes; and then calling on them, requested them to accompany him to the Residency. They declined. And in the afternoon he came to the Residency and mentioned these circumstances, which, after his departure, were reported to me by the native agent. I directed that a Peon should be sent to his house next morning, with instructions to accompany him to the residences of the two discovered witnesses, and to summon them before me. They came, and gave their evidence. After these explanations, the reader will be able to appreciate the value and delicacy of Mr. Reid's assertion, that "two or three days after" the first deposition of Jeyrow, (that is, about the 13th or 14th of July)—"*it seems to have been suggested* "*to Colonel Outram,* (A SUFFICIENT TIME HAVING ELAPSED TO "ENABLE JEYROW AND HIS FRIENDS TO FIND OUT TWO BRAHMINS

"AND TWO BANIANS, AND TO TUTOR THEM TO HIS PURPOSE,) *to* "*resume the investigation.*" And it may perhaps occur to the reader, as rather odd, on Mr. Reid's hypothesis, that Jeyrow was not ready with his "*tutored*" witnesses on the 13th or 14th July, when the "suggestion" emanating from himself was made to me. Still more odd will it probably appear, that when, about the 19th, he *did* come to the Residency, instead of immediately fetching the men whose "tutoring" had been complete some days before, he should have gone off, on nepotic cares intent, to Borsud.

In continuation of his remarks just commented on, Mr. Reid proceeds:—

"Next comes the examination of the first Brahmin witness, commencing with a leading question, instructing him at once, *even had he not been previously tutored, as to the answer required from him*, and for which Colonel Outram is constrained to make an apology, (*vide* note appended to this man's deposition). He *of course* deposed to all that was wanted. On the 2nd, 4th, and 6th September, we have the evidence of the three remaining witnesses; all certifying, *with wonderful similarity*, facts which occurred nearly two years back; all their statements being taken down by one and the same karkoon (clerk) (*vide* Col. Outram's Statement of Facts of 6th April 1851, par. 47), and, if we may judge from the explanation given by Colonel Outram in the note above alluded to, taken perhaps in the presence of the Resident, but while that officer was 'otherwise engaged.'" p. 44.

There is a zeal which outruns discretion; a devotion to the cause of his client which sometimes prompts the advocate to "*prove too much.*" And here Mr. Reid—though he cannot be said to *prove*——decidedly *asserts* too much. For if the Brahmin had been "previously tutored as to the answer required from him," where was the necessity, where the wisdom, where the most remote probability of a leading question being put to him? In complete oversight, or in superb contempt of the Blue Books which were before him when he wrote, Mr. Reid assumes that the Fudkey whom he represents as the very prince of intriguers, got up all the evidence. Yet he does not hesitate to attribute to him a clumsiness of execution of which the veriest tyro in conspiracy

and intrigue would be ashamed. And, inaccurate even in the simplest allusions to matters of fact, he talks of my having been "*constrained to make an apology*" for the puerile blunder of the conspirators against the honour of that convicted criminal for whom he exhibits so mysterious a regard and sympathy. I made no apology. None was requisite. I simply, in handing up the depositions "for such notice as Government may deem them deserving of," thought it my duty to add the following *nota bene*:—

"The first question put to this witness was written in my presence, but being otherwise engaged at the time, and not contemplating that the karkoon would commence the examination otherwise than in the usual general style, I was not aware of the leading nature of the first question put, until the whole deposition was read over to me at the conclusion of the examination; although the leading nature of that question is calculated to weaken the value of the testimony given in this deposition, yet from the straightforward way in which the witness answered all my subsequent questions, I have no reason to doubt the truth of his entire statement."

At the time when this deposition was taken, I was working sixteen hours per diem. And even with this devotion to business my time was incessantly encroached on. If my memory serves me right, I was answering a note when the Brahmin was called before me. At all events, I was employed on something only momentarily occupying my attention. I directed the native clerk to proceed with the deposition, intending him merely to fill up the usual heading as to name, profession, age, &c.—and to ask what he recollected about meeting Jeyrow at Nursoo's house. It was the same clerk who had taken down Jeyrow's deposition. He was thus aware of the nature of the statements I was prepared for; and he committed the error of putting the leading question adverted to, before I had finished the matter to which my attention was for the moment directed.*

* It might have occurred to Mr. Reid that if I had been half as unprincipled as Mr. Reid in more than one place insinuates, I would have simply caused the Carkoon (represented as in the conspiracy) to re-write the opening question, and thus have superseded the necessity of adding what he calls "an apology."

As regards the wonderful uniformity in the statements of the witnesses, I may observe, that they were all testifying to one fact. And no man in England knows better than Mr. Reid that it is utterly impossible to extract a direct sententious answer from a native; that in recording native evidence it is necessary to abbreviate their periphrastic language; and that, therefore, when one clerk takes down the depositions of several witnesses to a single point, there necessarily is a strong similarity in the phrases employed in conveying the deponents' statements. On this subject Mr. Reid refers to a passage in my "Statement of Facts," as if it bore out his insinuations. To enable the reader to judge how far it does so, I subjoin it; simply premising that a passing remark in a private letter from a friend high in office in Bombay, had led me to infer that Government, in declining to take any notice of the depositions, had been influenced by a suspicion that there was some collusion between the deponents:

"As Government did not assign any reasons for so summarily disposing of the Appendix (J.) of my letter of the 7th September 1850, I am of course unable to explain away their objection to it. I am, however, inclined to think that an idea of collusion was suggested by the similarity of the depositions of those who declared they had heard Nursoo Punt speak, as was alleged in the petition referred to above. Should such a view have been taken by Government, I would beg to observe, that the men all deposed to a simple fact, and that their depositions were all taken down by the same carkoon—circumstances fully accounting for a close approximation of language, if not for identity. Further, the depositions of the different peons sent with Hybutrow to summon the parties, and the difficulty he had in pointing them out, with other circumstances detailed in their examinations, tended to show that there was no collusion or even previous acquaintance between them; and I would respectfully beg to observe that the depositions contained in the unnoticed appendix (H.) of the same letter, referring to Nursoo Punt's complicity with Baba Nafra in the Craig affair,* bore no trait of having been in collusion with the men whose depositions were given

* Craig had received a large sum of money to be given to Mr. Reid. And this appendix (H.) Government did not do me the honour of even acknowledging.

in Appendix (J.) I would also beg to remind Government, that I professed to have other causes for believing 'that most of what the petitioner had since advanced was susceptible of proof.' These causes I was prepared to assign, had Government told me they considered the evidence submitted to them unsatisfactory; *and these causes I should have stated in my letter of the 7th September, had it for a moment occurred to me that Government would consider my despatches insufficient justification for instituting a rigorous enquiry into a matter so painfully connected in the public mind with one of its own members, and with the late native agent; such an enquiry was all I wanted, and I abstained, from motives of delicacy, from saying more than I thought was necessary to induce it.*" BB. p. 1063.

Mr. Reid thus proceeds:—

"Will any one pretend to say that this was an honest and fair enquiry? Yet Colonel Outram believes it so; thinks it impossible there could have been any collusion, and treats the whole case as most satisfactorily proved! By unprejudiced parties this can be viewed only as convincing proof of the little difficulty that Furké and his friends (Soorujram, the native agent, being of the number,) must have experienced, in inducing the Resident to believe anything; and a question will necessarily arise in their minds, how far, if all Colonel Outram's investigations have been carried on in a similar spirit, they are to be depended on. The Government, as might be expected, at once declined to take any steps in such a matter, for which proceeding they are severely censured in the "Statement of Facts" of the 6th of April 1851, par. 47."—pp. 44, 45.

As I have already said, the Fudkey was not even permitted to pay me formal visits of ceremony. Still less was he admitted to private audiences. And Nursoo Punt's friends had contrived to create a bitterness on the part of Sooruzram towards the Fudkey, by insinuating that so soon as the latter had emerged from the cloud (of Government displeasure) under which he then was, he would endeavour to obtain the native agency. If by this time reflection has not made Mr. Reid regret the delicate insinuations here and elsewhere indulged in against myself, it were in vain to attempt to show him that he ought to do so; if he does, then there is no necessity for the attempt. And as little necessary is it to notice the conclusions which he bases on the "IF" he so ingeniously introduces. The commendation of the Board of

Control and Court of Directors, would have amply compensated me for any disapprobation expressed by Mr. Reid, even while I held that opinion of his character, to which I have given expression in the Blue Books; and now that Mr. Reid chooses to identify his cause with that of the convicted criminal Nursoo Punt, to imply doubts regarding the guilt of the infamous Nafra, and to attempt to *sneer away* public sympathy from the persecuted Joitabhae, his disapprobation I feel not to be uncomplimentary.

The Government *did* refuse to pay any attention to the depositions I forwarded regarding Nursoo's boasts to Jeyrow, just as they refused to notice the depositions relative to the money intended for Mr. Reid's hands. But how far Mr. Reid is justified in saying that I "*severely censured*" them for refusals which impressed the natives of Baroda with the belief that his colleagues and successors dreaded an investigation, as certain to lead to a full exposure of the practices imputed to him, the reader may judge for himself. The paragraph cited by Mr. Reid in support of his assertion, is that given at pages 79 and 80.

Having now noticed, and I hope disposed of, the unwarrantable allegations and insinuations of Mr. Reid, I have only to repeat that, had I failed to dispose of them, the circumstance would in no degree have been relevant to that gentleman's defence. The facts, which Mr. Reid has so bemystified, would have been left as they originally stood. And these facts are—that no steps were taken in respect of Jeyrow's petition, until measures were adopted calculated to deter him from coming forward to avow it; that when it *was* sent, it was—in violation of official usage—sent, not for report, but to ascertain whether its signature were that of "a person;" and that, as Mr. Reid must acknowledge, the individual through whom it was Captain French's duty to ascertain this point was—NURSOO HIMSELF.

In conclusion, I have simply to reiterate the statement previously made by me, that Mr. Frere, who carried on an independent, careful, and prolonged investigation, decided that Jeyrow's statements were substantially correct. He determined that Nursoo

did make an improper use of Mr. Reid's name; that he boasted of his secret friendship with that gentleman; that he still further endeavoured to clench his argument, by giving all the publicity in his power to the extraordinary and melancholy document which forms the subject of the next Chapter.

CHAPTER V.

THE MAURRICE LETTER.

On the 9th of January 1849, Captain French received the instructions of Government, to ascertain whether the signature of the petition discussed in the preceding Chapter was that of "*a person.*" On the preceding day a letter bearing the same date as these instructions, had not only authorized, but practically urged him to invite Nursoo to recall his resignation. And the same post which brought the latter of these communications, (or, as I am inclined to believe, the post of the previous day,) conveyed to Nursoo a missive dated "Bombay, January the 3rd," which he lost no time in displaying to friend and foe.* It was as follows:—

"The Honourable Mr. Reid desires me to inform you that your petition,† dated the 18th September last, has been received by Government, and after carefully reading it, and taking into consideration your services for thirty years, MR. REID WROTE A MINUTE STRONGLY RECOMMENDING YOUR CASE TO THE MERCIFUL CONSIDERATION OF GOVERNMENT. Accordingly an order will be issued in a few days to Captain French, desiring him to tell you, that—*as Colonel Outram is gone from Baroda*—if you wish to continue as native agent, Government will have no objection to your withdrawing your application for pension. Captain French will also be informed that Baba Fudkey is not to be allowed to have anything to do with Government business.

---

* This letter was posted on the 4th, and it is my belief, (as it is that of Mr. Reid himself, p. 50,) that it reached Baroda on the 7th. If I recollect right, however, Mr. Frere saw reason to accept Nursoo's assertion that it did not arrive till the 8th. So the 8th be it.

† Not alluded to in the official documents, though it had been "*circulated.*"

"Mr. Reid says, when he goes out of Council *he will recommend you to the protection of Mr. Willoughby*, BUT THAT YOU SHOULD BE VERY CAREFUL HOW YOU CONDUCT YOURSELF; YOU must not, on any account, allow your private feelings of enmity against Baba Nafra to interfere with the business of the house of Hurree Bhughtee, at the Residency. That firm is an old firm, and in consideration of the services which that firm rendered in former years to the Gaekwar Government, the Bombay Government treats them with respect. *And though Colonel Outram strongly recommended that their Bhandaree ("guarantee") should be cancelled, still*, BY THE FAVOUR OF MR. REID AND MR. WILLOUGHBY, *this has not been done*, therefore you must not try from bad feelings to injure that firm. *

Yours, &c.,

"3rd January 1849. (Signed) J. R. MAURRICE."

P.S.—Keep the contents of this letter secret, and as soon as you read it write an answer to me, and thank Mr. Reid for his kindness to you. Address me by post, Mr. John R. Maurrice, at Mr. Reid's house, Bombay."

I may have erred in representing to Government that this letter, viewed in connection with antecedent occurrences, was calculated to foster the belief, that in Mr. Reid both Baba Nafra and Nursoo Punt had a secret ally. But if so, I, at all events, committed no greater error than that of which Mr. Commissioner Frere was guilty, after a pains-taking investigation of the whole of Nursoo's proceedings. When that gentleman, on the 22nd October, 1851, submitted his Judicial Report to Government,

---

* As regards the well simulated mutual hostility enacted by Nursoo and Baba Nafra, *vide antea*, pp. 49, 50. That Nursoo, when writing to his friends in Bombay respecting my suspicions of his collusion with Baba Nafra, should have endeavoured to enlist their sympathy by a denunciation of that man, and by words and menaces expressive of hostility towards him, is more than probable. And, though we have Mr. Reid's assurance, that no "*memorandum of Kullumbundee*" ever reached himself, we may legitimately suppose, that some such document, breathing unfriendliness to Nafra, reached the writer of this letter, and that he either was beguiled into believing the hostility real, or feared lest Nursoo might overact his part and damage the interests of the Bank. And, as has already been stated (*antea* p. 56, note), Nursoo and Baba Nafra seem to have *had* a misunderstanding about the £28,000; which, TWICE IMPORTUNATELY DEMANDED BY NURSOO, *was not given till there had been ample time for Nursoo and Nafra to be made aware of the mysterious minute of the 7th of October.*

he remarked that the information contained in the Letter just given "*could only have been obtained from one of the members of Government, Mr. Secretary Malet, or some clerk in Mr. Malet's office.*" And he proceeded to observe that—"We cannot then be "surprised if the ignorant, unable to discriminate between un- "principled subordinates and the heads of Government, are "misled by ideas so prejudicial to our own personal character, "as well as to the character of the Government in general."

But though I deemed it my duty to point out to Government the unhappy tendency of this Letter, I systematically expressed my conviction that Mr. Reid had no more concern with it than myself. I regarded and treated it as one of the artifices of that widely spreading conspiracy amongst Baroda corruptionists and corrupt Government servants, by which Mr. Reid's name had, (unjustly I believed,) become associated in the public mind with "the foulest of deeds and the vilest of men." Mr. Reid, however, not satisfied with defending those on the assumption of whose guilt I based my faith in his own integrity, has, in reference to this particular Letter, seen fit to make certain unfounded assertions regarding myself; and these intermingled with so many irrelevant and bewildering remarks, that I am compelled, much against my will, to enter at some length into the features and fortunes of the document, the real bearings of which he has obscured, by a series of the most extraordinary mistakes that ever fell from the pen of a gentleman professing to be in search of the truth.

This Letter formed a portion of the evidence on which I rested my charge against Nursoo, of having made an improper and unauthorized use of Mr. Reid's name, with the view of persuading the people of Baroda that he enjoyed the corrupt friendship and support of that gentleman. Nursoo, of course, vehemently protested that he had never endeavoured to create any such belief. He supported these protestations by asserting that, from the first, he regarded the Letter as a "hoax," practised on him by some enemy. And he professed to have made every effort in his power to discover the writer. Mr. Frere, however, decided, that,

"Nursoo Punt's conduct does not justify the idea that he believed "the Letter to be a hoax—or that he treated it as such—or that "he tried to discover the author of it." And if the reader will favor me with his attention for a few minutes, I think I shall be able to show that Mr. Frere's decision is more worthy of acceptance than Mr. Reid's assumption of the truthfulness of Nursoo's protestations—an assumption on which he is seemingly inclined to risk his own reputation for integrity.

The Letter, received on the 7th or 8th of January 1849, Nursoo lost no time in despatching by the hands of a trusty messenger to Muncherjee, a Parsee shopkeeper at Baroda, and the intimate friend of the Fudkey. His ostensible object was to get Muncherjee (who writes English) to make a copy of it. His real motive, as judicially determined by Mr. Frere, was to effect "*the further promulgation of his boast*"—*that he enjoyed the secret friendship of Mr. Reid.* (B.B. p. 1051.) And when it is borne in mind that Muncherjee's friend was the man through whose honest efforts the rascality of several of Nursoo's friends and predecessors had been brought to light; that by his aid I had been enabled to trace out the frauds which Nursoo had failed to assist me in investigating; and that it was he whom I had suggested as Nursoo's successor, it must be allowed, that the native agent could hardly have selected a happier medium for giving publicity in the desired quarter to the facts by the promulgation of which he hoped to dishearten, and humiliate, those whom he regarded as his foes. Muncherjee's shop, moreover, was the great gossip mart of Baroda.

Muncherjee made the desired copy for Nursoo, and sent it to him with the original, by the hands of the messenger. But while ostensibly engaged in making Nursoo's copy, he took the unjustifiable liberty of quietly retaining a duplicate for himself. And this unauthorized copy it was which afterwards fell into my hands, and enabled me to bring the subject to the notice of Government.

The original, having served its purpose at Baroda, was forwarded by Nursoo to his son Keshow, who held an appointment at Bhansda, near Surat. And Keshow, having gone down to

Bombay on the 3rd or 4th March, "*for the purpose of paying his respects to Mr. Reid, who was then on the eve of leaving India,*" (BB. p. 1485,) proceeded to call on the person "from whom the letter purported to come." This individual expressed great anxiety to obtain possession of the document. Keshow having "unfortunately" left it at Surat, his wish could not be immediately complied with. A reluctant promise was, however, given, that it should be sent. After much delay it was eventually forwarded on the 20th of June 1849; and from that date till the 29th of April 1851, when (in consequence of some inquiries which it was thought fit to institute after I had brought Muncherjee's copy to the notice of Government) the original was secured by Mr. Secretary Malet, its career was marked by a series of extraordinary and not unamusing adventures.

To these I shall hereafter refer. But, in the meantime, I must request the reader's attention to one or two curious facts, a full appreciation of which is requisite to enable us to see our way through the mass of absurdities and falsehoods with which Nursoo and his son have laboured to obscure the subject, and which Mr. Reid, with a touching confidence in the veracity of a convicted criminal, desires us to accept.

The person from whom, in the opinion both of Nursoo and his son, the letter "*purported to come*" was not any *Mr. John R. Maurrice,* but a *Mr. James Morris,* Assistant Registrar of the Court of Sudder Adawlut.

This opinion was not based on investigations which had resulted in proving that there was no *Mr. John R. Maurrice* in Bombay; for we have it on Keshow's own authority, that no inquiries of any kind had been instituted up to the date of the visit which on the 3rd or 4th of March, he paid to *Mr. James Morris,* under the conviction that the letter "*purported to come*" from that individual.

Nor did this conviction rest on the handwriting of the letter; for both Nursoo and his son knew that the handwriting was NOT that of Mr. Morris.

Neither was it suggested by an erroneous belief that Mr. Morris

resided in the house of Mr. Reid; for it was known to both father and son that Mr. Morris was a *pater-familias*, rejoicing in the dignity of an independent domicile.

On what ground their conviction was based, I do not pretend to determine. For though the admission that such was really their conviction was made in 1849, when, to quote Mr. Reid's own words, (p. 52) "nothing had been discovered—no investigation "was going on—Nursoo Punt had apparently gained his object— "and was in favor with the acting Resident;"—their subsequent explanations and allusions were put forward in 1851, when Nursoo was on his trial before Mr. Frere, and when Keshow, as we shall see, was not very scrupulous as to what he swore to so long as he could improve his father's case. All I can positively affirm is, that Mr. Morris *was* the man from whom Nursoo and his son considered that the "Maurrice" letter "*purported to come;*" that the individual so promptly fixed on had commenced his career in the Revenue, then Mr. Reid's department of the Secretariat; that thence he was advanced to a situation under the Revenue Commissioner at Poonah, which caused him to become the office companion of Nursoo; and that in 1845 he was promoted to the honorable and well-paid appointment of Assistant Registrar of the Sudder Adawlut, of which Mr. Reid was, *ex officio*, chief judge.

If the assumption on the part of Nursoo and his son, that the letter professing to be written by *John R. Maurrice* "purported to come" from *James Morris*, be a somewhat curious circumstance, still more strange is the fact that Muncherjee, thoroughly impressed with the correctness of the assumption, changed *Maurrice* into *Morris*, when appending the signature to his own surreptitiously taken copy. How was this?—Muncherjee knew little or nothing of Bombay. He had been born and bred in Guzerat. His visits to the Presidency, I am assured by one who knows him well, had been few and very far between. While making his private copy of the letter, it was utterly impossible that he could have had time to institute the extended enquiries on the subject which would have been required to satisfy him that, while there was no Mr. Maurrice in Bombay, there was a Mr. Morris on such terms

of intimacy with Mr. Reid as to justify the belief that the letter was his. If there *had* been time to make the enquiries, it was highly improbable that, amongst his acquaintances at Baroda, there was any one familiar with the history of a person like Mr. Morris, whose name has only gained Indian notoriety through subsequent events. And even if Muncherjee *had* learned from some of his own acquaintances that Mr. Morris was on such terms with Mr. Reid as to render it probable that he would be employed by the latter in communicating confidential messages, he could only, Mr. Reid tells us, have derived such information from the Fudkey, or some reckless and mendacious enemy of himself and Nursoo. Whereas, as we have seen, Muncherjee's opinion regarding the person from whom the letter "*purported to come*," was coincident with that of the object of Mr. Reid's laudatory advocacy of the pure-minded Nursoo himself; and it was arrived at while copying the letter under instructions from Nursoo.

One hypothesis, and one only, appears to me adequate to the explanation of the remarkable coincidence that existed between the views of the immaculate Nursoo, and those of the "intimate friend of his rival, the Fudkey." It is, that, either in reply to some enquiry on the part of Muncherjee or "*with a view to the further promulgation of Nursoo's boast*," the messenger had not only recounted Mr. Morris's antecedents, but had volunteered the information which, for upwards of two years, not Muncherjee alone but many others at Baroda regarded as authentic, viz., that Mr. Reid had been in the habit of making use of Mr. Morris as a private secretary or confidential amanuensis. IF Nursoo's messenger DID make such a communication, nothing could be more natural than that Muncherjee, availing himself of the temporary absence of his visitor, should have turned up the "Bombay Calendar" to ascertain how far the tale was probable; and that, finding Mr. Morris to be assistant registrar to the court of which Mr. Reid was chief judge, he should, in making his own private copy, have substituted "Morris" for "Maurrice."* That such a communication

* It appears in the evidence that the messenger *did* go away while Muncherjee was making the copy.

was made, is intrinsically and, *a priori*, probable. The object of Nursoo, when anxious to secure "*the further promulgation of his boast*," was to create more than an ephemeral prestige. So clever a man could hardly have anticipated that the no less clever Fudkey would fail to institute inquiries, with a view to ascertain something of "Mr. Maurrice." And he must have forseen that unless he afforded an explanation of the unreal address given in the letter, the discovery that there was NO "Mr. Maurrice" in Bombay, would soon do more than merely throw discredit on the document.

Such a communication as I have hypothetically assumed, coupled with the nature and antecedents of the letter which elicited it, would have afforded Muncherjee a satisfactory explanation of Mr. Morris's reasons for disguising his name (and employing an amanuensis) when corresponding with a rogue like Nursoo, on whose fidelity to himself he could place no reliance. While the similarity of the assumed to the real name, may reasonably be supposed to have appeared to Muncherjee sufficiently great to authorise Mr. Reid to take in, and hand over to Mr. Morris, any letter presented at his house to the address of Mr. Maurrice.

The hypothesis I have hazarded is fully adequate to explain the very curious circumstance of Muncherjee having substituted the one name for the other, in his own copy of the Letter. And on no other hypothesis does the substitution appear to me susceptible of explanation. But it is only an hypothesis. Whether it be correct or not is, to myself, a matter of indifference; for I am no longer called on to fathom that "mystery of iniquity" which has resulted in placing Mr. Reid in his present disagreeable position. To the best of my ability I endeavoured to do so while at Baroda; and my reward has been defamation at the hands of Mr. Reid's friends in India, and calumny from his own pen in this country. His vindication has long since passed out of my hands into his own. And on him, not me, it rests to suggest the hypothesis he deems best calculated to explain the mysteries which surround this Letter in a manner consistent with his own honour. But no hypothesis can be accepted as satisfactory which

does not account for the fact, that Nursoo and his son at once recognised the Letter as "*purporting to come from Mr. Morris;*" that Muncherjee arrived, *per saltum*, at the same conclusion; and that, not merely Muncherjee, but the clerks in my office to whom Nursoo, on receipt of the Letter, vaunted of Mr. Reid's support,* and many others in the city of Baroda, continued for upwards of two years to believe not only that the Letter in question was written by Mr. Reid's order, and through the intervention of Mr. Morris, but that Mr. Morris was Mr. Reid's confidential clerk or secretary in the transaction of this business. But to resume.

Muncherjee's copy of the Letter came into my possession in January 1851, while I was engaged in framing a Report on the circumstances which had tended to create the belief, so general at Baroda, in the corruptibility of the Bombay Government. Pre-eminent amongst the auxiliaries to this belief were those strange incidents in the career of Nursoo Punt which had taken place during my absence in Egypt. And when treating of these, I of course introduced the episode of the "Maurrice Letter"—pointing out its bearings on the general question. Long prior, however, to the completion of my Report, the proceedings of the Government compelled me (in my own view of the case) to appeal against the manner in which my representations regarding Nursoo Punt had been treated. I accordingly prepared a "Statement of Facts" (B.B. p. 1054), into which I introduced most of what I had drafted for my Report. And amongst other topics, I of course adverted to the "Maurrice Letter,"—or, as I then called it, the "Morris" Letter—having before me only Muncherjee's copy, and being ignorant of the alteration which he had made in the name.

My "Statement" I despatched to Bombay on the 10th of April 1851. On the 29th, Mr. Secretary Malet summoned Mr. Morris to his office, and interrogated him respecting the letter, which, as I have already said, Keshow had forwarded to him on the 20th of June 1849. Mr. Morris had a second interview with Mr. Malet on the morning of the 30th. And on the afternoon of that day he

* As Mr. Frere has judicially determined.

transmitted the following communication to the Secretariat, to give Mr. Malet "*a clearer view of how he got the letter, and what he did with it,*" than what he was able to afford during his two interviews, the proceedings of which are not recorded.—

"Keshow must have first mentioned the letter to me on the 3rd or 4th March 1849, *as on the same occasion he told me he had come to Bombay for the purpose of paying his respects to Mr. Reid, who was then on the eve of leaving India.* The use of my name in such a transaction made me desirous to know more about it; and I asked him to let me have the letter, in view to detecting the writer, and punishing him, if possible, and he promised he would, which promise he fulfilled in his note from Bansda, dated 20th June 1849. On its receipt, it occurred to me to show it first to Mr. Rouget, but he failed to recognise the handwriting; *but before I could show it to others in the Secretariat, as I intended, I missed it, and could not account for its disappearance,* UNTIL IT TURNED UP IN THE POCKET OF AN OLD WAISTCOAT WHICH HAD LAIN A LONG TIME DISUSED. I then made it over to Mr. Showell, and again lost sight of it for a considerable time, *in consequence chiefly of his having to give it to the magistrate in evidence (!) of a robbery that had happened in his house.* From him I learnt that he had shown it to Mr. Thomas, and that neither of them could detect the writing.

"I said yesterday I thought it bore the signature of 'J. Maurice;' but it turns out, as you stated, that it is subscribed J. R. Maurrice. *After sending it to me, Keshow once or twice asked for it back, and his father also asked me to return it, during his visit to Bombay, in the suite of the Gaekwar;* BUT OWING TO ONE OR OTHER OF THE ABOVE ACCIDENTS, I WAS UNABLE TO DO SO AT THE TIME.

"*On further consideration of your question of this morning,* as to whether I ever wrote to the father or son on the subject of the letter, I can safely say that I never wrote to the father on any subject since I left the Revenue Commissioner's Office; but as regards the son, whose application or applications for the return of the letter were in writing, I cannot make so sure that I did not write in reply, to tell him that I could not then put my hand on it. My impression is, however, that I never did.

"Trusting that this account will give you a clearer view of how I got the letter, and what I did with it, than perhaps I was able to convey in my interviews yesterday and this morning. I beg, &c." (B.B. p. 1270.)

Mr. Morris expresses neither surprise nor indignation at Keshow and his father having taken for granted that the letter "*purported to come*" from himself. Yet one might have reasonably looked for both on the part of a man of whom Mr. Reid knew

nothing personally, and who could not legitimately have been in possession of the information which the letter communicated. And though "the use of his name in such a transaction made him anxious to know more about it," his anxiety was of a very mild and patient character. There was no demand that Keshow should accompany him to the presence of Mr. Reid, with a view to apprize that gentleman of a foul imposture affecting his character, and clearly denoting rascality on the part of some highly trusted individual—there was *no* chafing under three and a half months delay, that occurred in the transmission of the letter—no indignant remonstrance addressed to Keshow—no earnest representation on the subject made to his own or Nursoo's superiors. And when, at last, the letter came, the equanimity of Mr. Morris was unaffected. So little importance did he attach to it, that when, in August 1851, he was examined on oath, at the instance of Mr. Frere, he thus expressed himself—"I gave it (the letter) to Mr. Malet, two or three months ago, at his request. *Had he not asked me for it, it is probable I should not have given it to him, as I saw nothing in the matter that required me to do so.*" Even to Mr. Malet's head clerk, Mr. Thomas, it had been shown not by Mr. Morris but by Mr. Showell. And, as we shall presently see, the perfunctory nature of the examination bestowed on it by Messrs. Rouget and Showell were worthy of the indifference of the person most concerned.

Both Mr. Morris and Keshow were, as I have already said, examined on oath during Nursoo Punt's trial—the former in Bombay, by a commission appointed by Mr. Frere; the latter at Baroda, by Mr. Frere himself. And the value of the testimony afforded by Nursoo's son, may be best appreciated by collating portions of it with the evidence given by Mr. Morris on the same subject.

Mr. Morris.	*Keshow Row.*
	"I got this letter (the original) from my father, in about January 1849, and he directed me to try to find out the writer thereof; and as I intended to go to Bombay myself, I

Mr. Morris.

"Our conversation was cursory, *but it related principally to his wish to see Mr. Reid* who was living with Mr. Bell, and to his having failed to obtain an interview that morning, (3rd or 4th of March.) *He also spoke of the letter, which I pressed him to show me*, and he promised he would do so, *after consulting with his father*, when he returned to Goozerat.

"HE APPEARED TO HESITATE ABOUT LETTING ME HAVE THE LETTER AT FIRST, BUT I URGED HIM TO DO SO, *with the view of discovering who made*

Keshow Row.

did not write to anybody on the subject until I went. It was about March 1849. *My servants unfortunately left; the Dufter was at home;** I learned this only upon my arrival in Bombay, when looking for the paper; *and as the letter purported to come from Mr. Morris, I went to that person in the Sudr 'Adawlut, and informed him of the purport of it, and told him, as I suspected some of my father's enemies had played that trick, I should be much obliged by his discovering the author of it.'*"—Keshow's examination on oath before Mr. Commissioner Frere, on the 15th August 1851.

"I went to Bombay in March 1849, for two or three reasons; to see friends to the Grant Medical College for advice" * * * "I went chiefly to Bombay to see old schoolfellows. I went particularly to see Mr. Reid, at his place, but could not see him. I met him accidentally at the Secretariat. I went to and came back from Bombay within about a week. I only called once at Mr. Reid's, but could not see him. *I did not mention to Mr. Reid, at the Secretariat, anything about this letter of Mr. Morris,* NOR TO MR. MALET."† * * * * "*I am quite confident that I went to Mr. Morris to speak to him on the subject of the letter, and that* IT WAS I ASKED HIM TO DISCOVER ITS AUTHORSHIP, NOT HE ASKED ME ABOUT THE LETTER."

"*The main object I had in going to see Mr. Morris in Bombay was to speak to him about the note.* I do not exactly remember whether I told him

* Probably a clerical error, for "my servants unfortunately left the Dufter (or bundle of papers) at home."

† This, be it recollected, was the man who was *panting* to discover the author of what he and his father profess to have regarded as a disgraceful libel on Mr. Reid, written by an enemy of Nursoo, with a view to "*entrap*" him;—a document, moreover, which, if not written by the man from whom "it purported to come," *clearly proved foul treachery in Mr. Malet's department of the Secretariat!*

Mr. Morris.	*Keshow Row.*
such a use of my name. HE THEN SEEMED TO FALL INTO MY VIEWS AND PROMISED TO SEND IT."	how I came not to have the note with me. MR. MORRIS DID NOR ASK FOR THE NOTE; I OFFERED TO SEND IT. *I did not say anything to him about consulting my father before sending the note."* * * *"I am certain that the note was the principal subject of my conversation with Mr. Morris,* NOT THE WISH TO SEE MR. REID."
	"I am quite certain that the three months (and no part of it) that elapsed between my return to Surat and sending the letter to Mr. Morris, was employed in consulting my father whether to send it or not."—(Keshow Row's examination of 8th September, 1851, on oath, before Mr. Commissioner Frere).
"IT WAS SENT TO ME BY KESHOW ROW, THE SON OF NURSOO PUNT, THROUGH THE POST OFFICE."	" *After my return to Surat,* I SENT THE LETTER, WITH A NOTE, TO MR. MORRIS, BY A MERCHANT GOING TO BOMBAY, *by name Dyaram Pitamber. I told him it was an important paper, and that I should feel obliged by his personally delivering the same to Mr. Morris, and bringing it back to me again, with Mr. Morris' answer. I was in Bansda when the merchant returned;* AND ON MY RETURN TO SURAT (about two months after sending the letter), HE GAVE ME MR. MORRIS' ANSWER, to the effect that Mr. Morris had been unable to trace the author; and writing from office, the letter was at home, so he would return it by some future opportunity." * * * *"I never wrote again to Mr. Morris for the note, or sent for it;* but when my father was in Bombay with the Guicowar, he told me he had asked for it."—(Keshow Row's examination on oath, before Mr. Commissioner Frere, 16th August 1851).
"*As far as my recollection serves me, he asked for it twice back, by letter.*" " Nursoo Punt asked me to return the letter, and I told him that I could not put my hands on it, and that I was afraid it was lost. I promised to search for it, and send it to him when I found it. *His manner more than his language induced me to believe he was anxious on the subject,* i.e. *the return of the letter.*"—(Mr. Morris' examination, on oath, at Bombay, 28th August, 1851).	" On my return to Surat, I went to Bansda, I think, immediately, and there fell sick, and could not return to Surat till about June. The note was in my papers at Surat, but I think I left that evening. *I took the note with my papers to Bansda,* BECAUSE I DID NOT LIKE TO SEND IT BY POST, SO LONG AS I COULD SEND IT BY

Mr. Morris.

Keshow Row.

A PRIVATE HAND. I cannot say why I did not mention the reason of the delay to Mr. Morris." — (Keshow Row's examination on oath, before Mr. Commissioner Frere, 8th Sept. 1851.)

" The impression on my mind that I actually sent extracts C. and K.* to Mr. Morris, with Dyaram, was so very strong, that the word 'paid' did not shake my belief.† *But when I observed in Mr. Morris' answer that he got my letter from Bansda,* THROUGH THE POST, *I referred to a copy of exhibit K., and found it dated from Bansda;* AND EVER SINCE I HAVE BEGUN TO THINK WHETHER, ON FINDING THAT I COULD NOT THEN RETURN TO SURAT, *or rather that Dyarum, or any friend, was not going over to Bombay,* I MAY NOT HAVE MADE UP MY MIND TO SEND IT TO MR. MORRIS BY POST, *to avoid further delay, and done so accordingly.* At the same time, I feel so certain of having asked Dyaram to take my letter on the subject to Mr. Morris, whenever he went to Bombay, and of having at least sent it with him, that unless I subsequently wrote to Mr. Morris with that man, (inquiring whether the letter I had already sent by post had reached him, and if he had succeeded in tracing the author), my first impression of having sent K. with Dyaram should be correct."—(Keshow Row's Letter to Mr. Frere,‡ dated 9th September 1851, when on Mr. Morris' evidence (taken in Bombay) being produced in Court, Keshow saw how he had committed himself.)

---

* Exhibit C. was the original Maurrice letter; K. Nursoo's letter of 20th June 1849.

† Deposition of the 28th August.

‡ N.B. Written in consequence of seeing Mr. Morris' letter, subsequent to his examination on the previous day. It is as follows:—

"Bansda, 20 June 1849.

"I beg to enclose herein the *secret note* of which I spoke to you when I last met you in Bombay. My father is very anxious to find out its author.

That one or the other, or both, of these witnesses must have given false accounts is, I think, hardly to be doubted. And it rests with Mr. Reid to select the one on whose testimony he conceives most reliance is to be placed. For though he has, in defending himself from the charge of Indus, and in his allegations against myself, *assumed* the veracity both of Mr. Morris and Nursoo, he can hardly persist in claiming the testimony of both, after such an exposition of the conflicting nature of their Statements.* For my own part I have no hesitation in still adhering to the following remarks made by me on the subject, in October 1851:—

"The conviction will, I believe, force itself on most impartial minds, that the letter of the 3rd of January 1849, was actually written at the instance of Mr. Morris; that Mr Morris, in his conversation with Keshow Row,

---

If you succeed in tracing him out you will very highly oblige us by informing me of the same. When you are done with it, be pleased to return me the note. You will perceive that the envelope bears the post-office stamp, but on inquiry in the Bombay post-office I learnt that its records could furnish us no clue to find out the rogue, for the names of the parties sending bearing letters through post are not registered, as we supposed. Pardon my not having written to you earlier on this subject, as I had promised to do.

"I have got another note of the same description, but it is anonymous, and purports to come from an old school friend of mine, *while the one I now send you purports to come from you though in the signature your name is not properly spelt.* If you like, I can send you the other note also; but I must at the same time inform you that the handwriting of both the notes is not the same.

"The object of the anonymous note was to alarm my father, *while that of the other was to entrap him*; and the mis-spelling of your name is certainly a clever trick, which I think must have been purposely done by the writer, (partly) with the view of escaping punishment, should he be detected. * *

"Excuse the trouble I give you. I could not stop in Bombay to make myself acquainted with your son, yet I wish you will present him my best salams.

"Hoping to hear from you soon."

* It is very remarkable that though Mr. Reid more than once alludes to the appendix to my Khutput Report (BB. pp. 1448-88), from which I have extracted the foregoing comparison of the testimony of the two witnesses, he utterly ignores this demonstration of the untrustworthiness of at least one of them.

finding that the letter had been shewn about, was anxious to get it back into his possession; that it was agreed that Keshow Row should send such a letter as that which he actually addressed to Mr. Morris on the 20th of June; that Keshow Row and his father had been with difficulty induced to implement the promise of the former; and that, when the letter was obtained, Mr. Morris showed it to one or two of his friends, merely that in the event of any future discussions regarding it, he might be in a position to say he had taken measures to discover the authorship of the document."

We have seen the nature of the measure which Mr. Morris himself professes to have adopted with a view to discover the writer of the letter. Let us now see what light is thrown on these measures by the statements of those to whom Mr. Morris showed it. And this will enable us to determine how far Mr. Reid's language, to be afterwards cited, is calculated to give his readers a correct idea of the merits of the case.

The first person to whom Mr. Morris showed the letter, was not any of his own superiors in the Sudder Adawlut—nor Mr. Secretary Malet, whose department it more immediately concerned —but Mr. Rouget, the head clerk of the general department of the Secretariat. The conduct of Mr. Rouget and the other clerks whom Mr. Morris professed to have consulted, in not having brought to the notice of Government the existence of "a letter which seriously affected the reputation of an ex-governor and ex-member of council, and which distinctly proved that somewhere or other there were traitors in the Government employ," appeared to me highly censurable. And in my Khutput Report I alluded to it as "indicating a lamentable state of morality in the Secretariat;" and as calculated (in connection with antecedent and subsequent discoveries,) to give the Honourable Court some faint idea of the extra-official difficulties with which their political officers have to contend.

As I had been officially described as a "monomaniac"—"credulous"—and ignorant of human nature,—for having thought it perfectly possible to eradicate the belief that the higher Bombay functionaries were corrupt, it was hardly to be expected that my remarks would have much weight with the authorities. But it

happened that Mr. Frere had, in his judicial report, expressed exactly similar opinions. He had thus written:—

"The conduct of Messrs. Smith, Rouget, Showel, and Thomas, in not having instituted some immediate enquiry and denounced the wrong-doer, appears most inexplicable; *and unless the breach of trust herein indicated is considered a very venial offence in Bombay,* one would have thought their first impulse would have been to have tried to discover who he was, or at any rate that they would have informed you of the fact, and thus put you on your guard; but the evidence in this case goes to show, that though the letter was in Bombay, in June 1849, you were not made acquainted with the fact till April last. Mr. Morris also appears to have evinced a degree of apathy not to be expected from a person either jealous of the honour of the Government he serves, or anxious to discover who had misused his or a similar sounding name. *Had I, while inquiring into Nursoo Punt's conduct, made any enquiry into the conduct of those mentioned above, I should have evidently gone beyond my commission;* BUT I SHOULD AS CERTAINLY HAVE NEGLECTED MY DUTY TO GOVERNMENT, DID I NOT BRING THE SUBJECT THUS PROMINENTLY TO YOUR NOTICE." B.B. p. 1014.

Prior to the receipt by Government of Mr. Frere's communication, I had thrown still further light on the "*morality of the Secretariat,*" by intercepting, during their passage through the Baroda post-office, minutes and other documents obtained on behalf of the Guicowar's minister and Baroda corruptionists, from traitors in the secret department. An enquiry was, therefore, resolved on. And on the 24th of December 1851, Mr. Rouget was called on to explain the extent to which he had been mixed up with the letters. His statement was as follows.—

"With reference to Mr. Frere's mention of my name as being cognizant of the existence of a note or letter, purporting to have been addressed by Mr. Maurrice to Nursoo Punt, I beg to state, that all I know of it is this: some time (perhaps about two years) ago, Mr. Maurice showed me the note alluded to, and (*I think*) asked whether I knew the handwriting. I replied in the negative, *having no knowledge of the handwriting; and never having for a moment supposed that it contained anything worthy of notice, I gave the matter no further thought, and it passed from my mind altogether,* until a short time ago, Mr. Morris told me that some inquiries had been made, or were making, after the said note. The above is stated on recollection, which, however, is *very faint* on this

subject, *as I paid no attention to the note.* I CANNOT SAY WITH ANY DEGREE OF CERTAINTY WHETHER I READ THE NOTE THROUGH, BUT RATHER THINK NOT. So far from concealing the existence of the note, on which Mr. Frere seems to lay such great stress, it never occurred to me that there was anything to conceal. The note was not in my possession, it was not addressed to me, nor is it likely to have been written by me; I therefore never gave it a second thought." B.B., p. 1048.

So much for the "efforts" made to discover the authorship of the note through Mr. Rouget.

It was next, as Mr. Morris informs us, shown to Mr. Showell, after the long unused waistcoat had been again taken into wear. And here follows the account of his share in the investigation, given by Mr. Showell on the 5th of January 1852, twelve days after Mr. Rouget and Mr. Thomas had recorded their explanations.

"With reference to paragraph 21 of a letter from W. E. Frere, Esq., 'Special Commissioner, Baroda,' dated 22nd October 1851, shown to me by you this day, and which relates to a letter, signed by 'J. R. Maurrice,' purporting to have been addressed to 'Nursoo Punt,' I beg leave respectfully to state, that on the occasion, as well as I can now recollect (perhaps two years ago,) of calling on Mr. Morris, *in the course of a morning walk*, he mentioned to me that he had received from Nursoba a letter, bearing the above signature, which he showed me. *After reading it, I asked him*, as I could not myself identify the handwriting, *to allow me to take it to Mr. Thomas*, to see if he could trace the writer. Mr. Morris gave me the said letter for the above-stated purpose, and I believe I took it to the office the same day, and showed it to Mr. Thomas, who kept it for, I think, not more than three weeks, when he returned it to me, saying, he had not been able to discover the writer.

"Serving, as I do, in a different department, I was, of course, totally ignorant of every proceeding on the records of Government, *a knowledge of which would have enabled me to attach importance to the letter in question.* I neither had, nor could have had, any other motive in taking the letter from Mr. Morris for the purpose I have stated, than that of helping in the discovery of the author OF SUCH A DOCUMENT. *And the indifference with which Mr. Morris mentioned the circumstance to me, left on my mind the impression that he also did not think much of the matter.*

"It will thus be seen that my first impulse, and on which I acted, was the identical one which Mr. Frere considers should have actuated me; and solemnly assuring Government of the truth of what I have stated,

I earnestly hope that so far from allowing my conduct in the affair to be condemned in the terms used by Mr. Frere, his Lordship in council will be pleased to accord his approval of it." B.B., p. 1048.

On the 24th of December, Mr. Thomas, the chief clerk in the secret department, and the head of the uncovenanted servants of the Secretariat, had been called on for *his* explanation, when he recorded as follows:—

"With reference to the mention of my name, made in paragraph 24 of Mr. Frere's letter to Government, dated the 22nd October last, in connection with a letter which was addressed, in the early part of the year 1849, to Nursoo Punt, native agent to the Resident at Baroda, in the name of "J. R. Maurrice," I beg to state, that I have *a recollection* of the letter in question having been shown to me a long time since, by Mr. Showell, uncovenanted assistant to the Secretary to Government in the Revenue Department, who, *as far as I can remember*, told me, that it was *suspected* that it had been *intended* by the writer of the letter, that Nursoo Punt should be *led to suppose* that it proceeded from Mr. J. Morris, 1st Assistant Registrar, Sudder Adawlut, and *that Mr. Morris had requested Mr. Showell to show the letter to me*, supposing it possible that I might be able to recognize the handwriting.

"At my request, Mr. Showell left the above letter with me, and I lost no time in showing the same to the Chief Secretary; if the Chief Secretary was in the office at the time, I can safely state that I showed it to that gentleman on the same day; but if not, on the day following, on the Chief Secretary coming to office.

"At this distant period I cannot positively state when the letter in question was shown to me on the above occasion, by Mr. Showell; but I believe it to have been in the Monsoon of 1849. My reason for fixing upon this date is, that I remember remarking to Mr. Showell that the letter was several months old when he showed it to me, and I remember that the windows of my office-room were, in consequence of its raining, closed at the time. I am able thus to charge my recollection, as Mr. Showell is not in the habit of frequently visiting me in my office, and probably has not done so more than a dozen times since he has been in the Secretariat.

"On the 19th July 1850, I proceeded to Ceylon on sick leave, and remained away until the end of December following, and I am confident that the occurrence took place before my departure, and my impression is as above stated, that it was during the previous Monsoon (1849)." B.B. p. 1047, 8.

It will be seen that the recollections of Mr. Thomas were not

quite identical with those of either Mr. Morris himself, or of Mr. Showell.

Mr. Smith's explanation, also taken on the 24th December 1851, was very brief. I subjoin it:

"I remember having a long time since seen a Letter called the "Maurice" Letter, and as Mr. Thomas had informed me that he had brought it to the notice of the Chief Secretary, I did not consider it necessary that I should do so likewise."

In a second of two "Memorandums," both dated the 22nd January 1852, Mr. Secretary Malet thus disposed of the subject:

"Mr. Frere, in thus bringing to the notice of Government what he considered to be facts, might have spared his animadversion; for the matters he has thus touched on, not having been judicially before him, he should naturally have supposed that some explanation might be afforded which would divest the behaviour of those gentlemen whom he has named, of the criminality he would attach to it; and the Chief Secretary begs here to quote the thirteenth and following paras. of a memorandum, *dated this day*, explanatory of certain portions of Colonel Outram's paper, intituled "Certain Facts relating to Nursoo Punt." This quotation contains all that has yet been discovered concerning the Letter signed J. R. Maurice, and shows that it might have been written by any one, whether in or out of the Secretariat, cognizant of the result of the deliberations of Government, and that as soon as the Letter was received, inquiries were set on foot to discover the author. These inquiries were, the Chief Secretary regrets, unsuccessful at that time, and even since, with many other sources of information not at that time available, no certain evidence as to the authorship of it has been obtained. The statements of the assistants in the Secretariat, whose names are mentioned by Mr. Frere, are also appended, marked Nos. 1 to 4." B.B. p. 1045.

The "Statement of Facts relating to Nursoo Punt," was the document previously referred to by me as having been forwarded to Government on the 10th of April 1851. The "Statements of the Assistants," alluded to by Mr. Malet, are those which I have just given. The 13th and 14th paras. of Mr. Malet's other memorandum I subjoin:

"In the year 1849, sometime between March and June, the Letter in question, signed J. R. Maurice, was sent by Nursoo Punt, as he states, for discovery of the writer, to Mr. J. Morris, the Assistant Registrar

in the Sudder Adawlut, who brought it to the notice of the assistants in the General (Mr. Rouget) and Revenue Departments (Mr. Showell) of the Secretariat, that they might try to trace the writing. Mr. Showell took it to Mr. Thomas, the assistant in the Political Department, who brought it to the Chief Secretary, who in vain endeavoured to trace likeness in the writing to any in the political branch in the Secretariat, *and the other assistants were equally unsuccessful in the departments to which they belonged.* The Chief Secretary could not discover by whom, at the date of the letter, the minutes might have been seen, as there had been no particular secrecy used nor enjoined; but they must have been seen by Mr. Craig, by whom the minute-book and Bengal abstract entries were always prepared. It is not clear from the Letter what minutes were before the writer when he penned it; but as that of the Right Honorable the Governor, dated the 28th December, was copied fair in the office by a sectioner, it must have been known to Craig, who registered the sectioner's work; and, from the Letter, it is evident that any one in the office who had seen the minutes, *or any one out of it*, who knew the results of the deliberations, might have written the letter in question. In short, although there was ample reason to infer that the letter emanated from some one who had an opportunity of knowing what was the result of the inquiry into Gorajee Pol's and Huree Bhugtee's cases, there was no ground to fix it on any one person in particular.

"14. Increased vigilance had been about that time exercised in the Political Department, in consequence of the detection of Bhasker Bhaeesett in the act of returning a letter which had been taken away over night, and who was dismissed in consequence. *The principal part in this discovery was taken by Mr. R. D. Craig*, the person above-mentioned, who was superintendent of sectioners, and who the Chief Secretary now *believes to have been the chief person through whom information was obtained from the Political Department;* a man who, having been employed for twelve or thirteen years, and during nearly the whole of that time confidentially so, in the Secret Department, had the the means of procuring almost any information he pleased; a man of a reserved disposition, belonging to the Free Church of Scotland, strict in the performance of religious formalities, and whose conduct in his official duties, even after the detection of his immorality, was apparently so guarded and steady, that no suspicion ever attached itself to him." B.B. p. 1043, 4.

Mr. Malet's censures are as applicable to myself as to Mr. Frere; and as Mr. Reid, who has throughout his whole Pamphlet ignored Mr. Frere and his representations, accuses me of having done

great injustice to the Secretariat clerks, I think it right to solicit the reader's attention while I offer a few remarks on this point.

On my return from Egypt in the beginning of 1850, I had many conversations with Mr. Malet about Baroda affairs, yet he never once alluded, in the most remote manner, to the existence of such a document as the Maurrice Letter. And when, in April 1851, he asked me to furnish him with the original of the document which had been returned with his cognizance to Mr. Morris, in 1849, he never hinted to me that he knew anything about it. Neither did he tell me that he had instituted "enquiries" with a view to the discovery of the author. He himself practically admits that the letter was not brought to the notice of Government in 1849; that the reference on the subject was not made to Mr. Morris at that time; and that when in April 1851, Mr. Morris *was* referred to, no questions were put to the Secretariat clerks whose names appeared in Mr. Morris's letter. The "explanations" subsequently given by these gentlemen were as little satisfactory as could well be conceived. And even Mr. Malet's letter does not accurately describe their contents—for neither Mr. Rouget nor Mr. Showell profess to have taken any pains in trying to trace out the hand writing.

The hypothesis that Mr. Craig was the author of the letter, may or may not be correct. The man who received large sums from the emissary of Baba Nafra under pretence of handing them over to Mr. Reid, would probably have shrunk from no villainy. But it is difficult to conceive what object he could have had in writing such a letter. It it more likely that he would have endeavoured to secure to himself any tribute of gratitude that Nursoo might have felt inclined to bestow on the supposed medium of communication selected by Mr. Reid. It was *not* his interest to do anything calculated to cause an enquiry which was likely to result in proving that the sums of money annually remitted from Baroda failed to reach the hands for whom they were intended. And the course he is supposed to have adopted, if not completely objectless, was calculated to lead to such an enquiry. Nursoo was invited to reply to the letter of the 3rd of January. The probability

was that he would,—*as the probability is that he* DID *reply.* The reply would either reach Mr. Morris, or it would go to the dead letter office and be returned to Nursoo. If it reached Mr. Morris, the chances were that that gentleman, conscious of having written nothing to elicit it, would have sent it to Mr. Reid, when enquiry must have been instituted; and that enquiry would not have tended to the prejudice of Mr. Morris. If the letters were returned to Nursoo, he would either have submitted the matter to his superiors, when investigation must have followed; or he would have held his peace, when nothing would have been gained by Mr. Craig.

Whoever it may have been who wrote the letter, he must have known more even than was contained in the Governor's (that is Mr. Reid's) minute of the 28th December. For though the information contained in the letter in reference to the prohibition against employing the Fudkey was perfectly true, it was not true, as the letter implied, that for *this* triumph over his hated rival and exposer, he was indebted to Mr. Reid. The prohibition was based on the minute of Mr. Willoughby, dated the 31st December: and Mr. Malet "is nearly certain that the papers (of which this "was one) were returned simultaneously with the proceedings on "Nursoo Punt's petition to be allowed to retire on his pension, "*which reached the office on the 3rd of January* 1849," (B.B. p. 1047,)—the day on which the private letter was written—and the day previous to that on which the Government dispatch was dated.

The grounds on which Mr. Malet based his hypothesis that the then fugitive Craig was the author of the letter, are thus stated:—

"It may not perhaps be irrelevant to remark, that though the Chief Secretary believes that Craig was the author of the letter signed J. R. Maurice, and of those addressed to Messrs. Reid and Willoughby, there has not, even since his departure, been discovered any clue to the hand-writing of the body of the petition; the suspicion being chiefly founded on the discoveries subsequently made concerning Craig's *character, his connexion with Hurree Bhugtee,* as shown in the evidence received from Colonel Outram, and *the opportunities which he had of*

obtaining the information WHICH HE WISHED TO GIVE,* the only similarities in the writing in the petition being the word "secret" on the envelope, which is *like his writing*, and that the signature J. R. Maurice is corrected with a different kind of ink, *exactly in the same manner as the signature attached to a letter known to be Craig's*,† which he forged as the 'death-bed confession' of a man on whose memory he wished to fasten the charge of having seduced his wife's sister, an incestuous crime of which he was himself guilty!" BB. p. 1046.

I have already traced out the history of the "Maurrice Letter" with a minuteness doubtless wearisome in the last degree to the reader; but not more minutely than the extraordinary, erroneous, and utterly irrelevant allusions made to it by Mr. Reid, render indispensably necessary in a Pamphlet which professes to dispose, once and for all, of his multiform misconceptions. And as he might possibly accuse me of evading his charges and insinuations if I did not grapple with them individually, I proceed to notice them in the order in which they appear in his Pamphlet; though it is, perhaps, too much to expect that the reader will have patience to follow me in the execution of my task. Those, indeed, who seek only a knowledge of the facts of the case, and do not wish to ascertain how far Mr. Reid has succeeded in mystifying them, may, if they please, pass over the remainder of this long Chapter.

At page 46 Mr. Reid thus writes:—

"I now come to the 'Maurrice' letter, bearing date the 3rd January 1849. Mr. J. Morris never was my confidential clerk. I never had a confidential clerk, or private clerk of any kind. Whilst Revenue Secretary, in any confidential business I employed the head clerks, Mr. Blowers, now deputy Postmaster-General, and Mr. F. Hutchinson, now Collector of Bombay; and them only. Whilst in Council, I recorded my minutes in my own handwriting; or had them transcribed from my rough drafts, by a copyist of the Secretariat. But I need scarcely do more on this point, than refer you to Colonel Outram's own words (par.

* But the same opportunities have been shown to have been enjoyed by others after Craig left.

It is not very likely that a man who had taken such precautions to prevent detection, would have committed himself by writing on the envelope a word which his amanuensis might have written.

† The meaning of this is not quite obvious.

34 of his Statement of Facts of 6th April 1851), where he observes, speaking of Mr. Morris, 'who, I had been told, though I now find erroneously, was a private clerk or secretary to Mr. Reid.' I conclude Furké or some of his party had told him so. He might have learned from this that such authority was not always sure. HOWEVER, THE POISON DID ITS WORK. *He had once stated the fact of Mr. Morris being my private clerk, and (as in the case of your correspondent) few would take the trouble to search for a disavowal*, AND, MOREOVER, SUBSEQUENTLY TO HIS KNOWLEDGE THAT MR. MORRIS WAS NOT MY CONFIDENTIAL CLERK, HE ALLUDES TO HIM AS IN THAT CAPACITY."

Mr. Reid is well aware not only that I never accused him of corruption, or of complicity with the corrupt, but that I persisted in declaring my belief that if the Government would only aid instead of thwarting my investigations, the result would be such a solution of the painful Baroda mysteries, as would completely vindicate his impugned character. And Mr. Reid is as well aware as myself, that in alluding to the relation in which Mr. Morris was "*supposed*" or "*understood*" to stand to Mr. Reid, I spoke of what was "supposed" and "understood"—and believed—by the natives of Baroda, and considered by them to be confirmatory of their views regarding Mr. Reid's corruptibility.

When in April 1851, I sent in my "Statement of Facts relative to Nursoo Punt," I mentioned what was the prevalent idea at Baroda; and as some inquiries led me to believe that the idea was an erroneous one, I stated so—modifying in that respect the portion of my Khutput Report on which my "Statement" was framed. Subsequent information, however, led me to infer that the general impression at Baroda regarding the relation in which Mr. Morris stood to Mr. Reid was not so erroneous—that he *had* been made use of as an amanuensis or confidential clerk. It was to myself a matter of supreme indifference whether he was so or not; for I continued to retain my original belief in Mr. Reid's purity. But I could not state that to be erroneous which, despite certain assurances made to me, I thought might possibly have been true; and there was no earthly reason why I should. The correctness or incorrectness of the popular idea was quite irrelevant to my subject, which was to convey to Government and the Court of Directors the views, impressions, and feelings of the natives of Baroda, in

respect of the corruptibility of high functionaries. In my Report (formally transmitted in October 1851,) I accordingly allowed it to stand as it was originally. And in an Appendix, for which, I "respectfully bespoke a careful perusal," I thus adverted to Mr. Morris:—

"He was Nursoo's friend, and had been his office companion; and, as I have said, was, whether correctly or not, supposed to have been employed by Mr. Reid in the capacity of confidential clerk."

In continuation of the observations on which I have just commented, Mr. Reid proceeds:

"I believe Mr. Morris was, many years back, in the Revenue department of the Secretariat, before he entered the office of the Revenue Commissioner. He was then appointed uncovenanted assistant to the Register of the Sudr Adalut. I was, ex-officio, Chief Judge of that Court, but, under its constitution, I had no judicial functions to perform, except in cases of very rare occurrence, wherein the Puisne Judges required the attendance of the Chief Judge on any difference of opinion which could not otherwise be adjusted. I had no concern whatever with the appointment of the subordinate officers of the Court; and I never interfered, either publicly or privately, in order to obtain the office of Assistant Register for Mr. Morris, of whom, personally, I knew nothing. I find no allusion to the "Maurrice" letter by Col. Outram in any part of the Blue Book before his "Statement of Facts" of 6th April 1851, par. 34. Copy of the letter is there given, signed "J. R. Morrice." The original letter we find signed "J. R. Maurrice." The object of the copyist from whom Colonel Outram obtained the document, in thus falsifying the signature, must be left to conjecture. *Nothing could be found in such falsification criminatory of Nursoo Punt, and,* THEREFORE, *this point is passed over by him in silence.* P.P. 47, 48.

Mr. Reid's inclination to impute dishonorable motives to others is now undeniable. But even HE must now admit that the less he ventilates the subject of the "*falsification*" of the signature of the Maurrice letter, the better it will be for his own cause, which he has in so incomprehensible a manner seen fit to identify with that of the immaculate Nursoo. If Mr. Reid will suggest an hypothesis consistent with the known and established facts of the case, which shall explain the "falsification" in a manner *not* criminatory of Nursoo, I shall be happy to accept it. And if he attempt any such dialectic feat, he will, perhaps, at the same time, have the kindness to explain why, if the substitution of "Morris" for

"Maurrice" was in no wise criminatory of Nursoo, it should be treated by himself as indicating a conspiracy either against that high-minded servant;—or against Mr. Morris, of whom Mr. Reid knew nothing personally—who had not been employed by him in the transaction of any business—who was not connected with the Secretariat or the Government—and who, therefore, was not in a position to excite the hostility of a Guzerat shopkeeper.

Mr. Reid thus proceeds:—

"In par. 15 of Appendix A. to Part II. of the Khutput Report, we find an account of how this copy was obtained. Col. Outram there says, 'in my Statement of Facts, relative to Nursoo Punt, which was 'dispatched from Baroda on the 10th of April, 1850, I reproduced the 'letter under notice, a copy of it having been placed in my hands by 'an individual to whom Nursoo had caused it to be submitted, knowing 'him to be a friend of Baba Fudkey's.' *He says* re-*produced, but I cannot find on what previous occasion he had produced it.* Again, in his letter of 29th April 1851, to Mr. Malet, Col. Outram states, 'I have 'not the original of the letter referred to; a copy only had been taken 'by a person at Baroda, to whom Nursoo Punt had shown it, as he did 'to several, with the view, I suppose, to discourage his enemies, and 'especially the author of the anonymous petition (received from Govern-'ment at the same time by Capt. French), from appearing against him, 'as indeed it effectually did. Dreading, as the people of Baroda do, 'Nursoo Punt's power and influence, the party who furnished the copy 'would, of course, rather not come forward, but, if absolutely necessary, 'he is ready to substantiate the fact of having made the copy from the 'original, and that the original was shown to him, as well as to others, 'by Nursoo Punt.' P.P. 48, 49.

1485.

This should be 1851.

1272.

For what object, or to serve what purpose, the second of the above quotations from my correspondence is given, I am at a loss even to surmise. The letter was a private note written by me, when in Bombay in April 1851, in reply to a private note from Mr. Secretary Malet, asking me if I had the original. The statements in that note are unimpugnable. Muncherjee would of course rather not have come forward—fearing those measures of vengeance on the part of Nursoo's friends, in the Baroda Durbar, *which have since overtaken him.* But, as Mr. Reid full well knew, he *did* come forward when required by me to do so; and the testimony he gave forms part of the evidence on which Mr. Frere convicted Nursoo.

Mr. Reid continues:—

1023. "Doubtless Furké, or Furké's intimate friend—the copyist who falsified the signature—was the party who falsely informed Colonel Outram that Mr. Morris was my confidential clerk.

It is a singular fact, that when Colonel Outram, on the 7th September
960. 1850, sent his two letters to Government, No. 207 A., and No. 207 B.—
960. the first, re-opening the cases of Govindrao Guikwar, and Guorojee Pol; the second, regarding the anonymous petition, the authorship of which Hybutrow came forward to claim;—he says nothing of the "Maurrice" letter, which would have strengthened greatly the point he desired to establish, and which, he would lead us to believe, was known throughout Baroda since January 1849! The only reasonable conclusion from this silence is, either that Furké had concealed from Colonel
1023. Outram the existence of this letter, (although Muncherjee, his intimate friend, had seen, and made a copy of it, about the latter date;) or that the story about Nursoo Punt's having paraded it, and Muncherjee's having copied it, is untrue. That the copy was in Colonel Outram's hands on the 11th January 1851, is stated by him in his Khutput
1414. Report, Part II., Sec. III., par. 69. He had it, therefore, at least three months in his possession before he communicated his knowledge of it to Government." P.P. 49, 50.

As I shall have occasion to show in a subsequent Chapter, Mr. Reid has throughout his Pamphlet stated and implied that an intimate intercourse subsisted between the Fudkey and myself, (*though the very Blue Books from which he was quoting proved his statements and insinuations to be* DIAMETRICALLY THE REVERSE OF TRUE). I cannot believe that this mistake was intentional. I attribute it, as I do all his other departures from fact, to the agitation under which he wrote, and to the embarrassments which he unavoidably experienced when linking the vindication of his own character with the defence of a convicted criminal. But as the misstatement has been made, I have simply here to observe that so far from consulting or obtaining information from the Fudkey, I did not, during the whole of the period adverted to, even permit him to visit me.*

---

* *Vide postea*, Chapter VIII. To that Chapter I would respectfully beg the reader's especial attention, as it relates to one of the ablest and

But Mr. Reid's logic is not more satisfactory than his "*facts*." He represents the Fudkey as having sought by intrigue and conspiracy to effect the ruin of the virtuous Nursoo. He represents me as the Fudkey's tool, consulting with him, and receiving from him all manner of false information to the prejudice of Nursoo; and yet he brings it as a charge against that very Fudkey that he "*had concealed*" from me one of the most damaging of the incidents recorded of Nursoo in my Reports! Nay, so bent does he seem on the stultification of his own argument, that he clenches the absurdity by urging as the alternative of its rejection, the necessity of assuming that Muncherjee took no copy of the Maurrice letter; though there is the fact that he *did* take a copy —that he *did* "falsify" the signature—that the original was sent away to Surat the day after its receipt—and that, from that day forward till the date of Nursoo's trial, it remained in the hands of Nursoo's son—in the waistcoat pocket of Mr. Morris—and in sundry other curious places and predicaments, which utterly exclude the supposition that it could have been again seen by Muncherjee, till, in August 1851, Mr. Frere presented it to him for identification in open court!

Nor is this all. Mr. Reid, who had assailed me in no mild or courteous terms throughout the preceding forty-nine pages of his Pamphlet, for having endeavoured to show to Government that his character had been aspersed, no sooner reaches his fiftieth page than he coolly turns round, and finds fault with me for allowing Muncherjee's copy to remain three months in my hands before I formally submitted it to Government. Mr. Reid well knows that I had little inducement to multiply my references to his friends in power. He knows—for he professes to have read the Blue Books—how my former representations had been treated. He is as well aware as I am, for it is detailed in the very passage cited by him, that on receiving Muncherjee's transcript of the

---

most deserving native gentlemen that ever was sacrificed for unflinching honesty; and one whose case will, I understand, soon be brought to the notice of Parliament.

letter in January 1851, I applied to Government for a copy of the irregularly transmitted petition therein alluded to, on the ground that "*it could only have had reference to my official proceedings in the investigations of the cases referred to.*" He knows that Mr. Willoughby ineffectually attempted to obtain compliance with my request. And he knows that I received the following laconic reply, not altogether accurately describing the document in which I had been accused of *being imposed on by the misrepresentations of interested individuals.*

"I am desired to state, that as it was not at the time considered *necessary* to forward a copy of the petition to you, *and as the petitioner merely requested that he might not be condemned without being heard in his defence*, his Lordship in Council considers it unnecessary to furnish you with a copy of the petition."

The letter was quoted *in extenso*, in my Report on Nursoo. To have sent it in advance would have simply been absurd.

Mr. Reid resumes:—

"The letter bears date the 3rd January 1849, and has the Bombay post mark of the 4th. Nursoo Punt must have received it on the 7th January 1849. HE NEVER ANSWERED IT. *His son Keshow came to Bombay in March* 1849. He then spoke to Mr. Morris on the subject. Mr. Morris denied the authorship, and desired to see the original letter, in order to discover the writer. Keshow sent him the original letter
1045. from Bansda on the 20th June, 1849. Mr. Morris produced it to Mr.
1083. Thomas, Mr. Rouget, and Mr. Showell, the head clerks of the political,
1047. judicial, and revenue departments. Mr. Thomas laid it immediately before the Chief Secretary. Enquiry was instituted, but the writer remained undiscovered." Page 50.

Mr. Reid cannot take it as a personal offence if I say that I utterly disbelieve the statement *to the effect that* NURSOO "NEVER ANSWERED" *the letter.* On such a point I decline to take the word of a convicted criminal—that of his son, whose prepared evidence I have recorded above—or even that of Mr. Morris. And unless Mr. Reid is prepared to boast of very intimate relations indeed with Nursoo and Mr. Morris, nothing can justify his making so bold an assertion—to be used in the next page as a well-established fact! But it is quite as well authenticated as the majority of Mr.

Reid's "*facts*;" and the reasoning is not weaker than the majority of his logical exercitations.

How correct an idea of the "enquiry" actually adopted, Mr. Reid's description is calculated to convey to the mind of his readers, no one who has read the official documents previously quoted by me can fail to discover.

In continuation of the last quotation, Mr. Reid proceeds:—

"Colonel Outram, (*vide* par. 27th of his Supplementary Khutput Report, of the 13th January 1852, and the Appendix,) makes a strong accusation against the subordinates of the Secretariat for not having brought forward the case of this letter, as soon as it became known to them. A reference to the pages I have above cited will show that his accusation is entirely groundless. The letter was shown to Mr. Malet, the Chief Secretary, in the Monsoon of 1849, (*vide* Mr. Thomas' statement.) Mr. Malet states, 'As soon as the letter was received, enquiries 'were set on foot to discover the author. Mr. Thomas in vain en-'deavoured to trace likeness in the writing to any in the political 'branch of the secretariat, and the other assistants were equally 'unsuccessful in the departments to which they belonged.' It is to be regretted that the matter was not then laid before the Council Board. Still, had it been so, it is probable that the result would have been merely to record the facts of the Chief Secretary's unsuccessful enquiries. It must be remembered that in the Monsoon of 1849 there was no agitation, such as has subsequently arisen, and this would have been considered one of those cases (of which I am sorry to say there never has been a want of instances) wherein the proceedings of the Government had improperly transpired, without any clue being found to the delinquent." P.P. 50, 51.

One would have fancied that Mr. Reid had quite enough on his hands in attempting to meet the accusations of Indus, without going out of his way to fight the battles of other people. But he is of course the best judge of that mode of vindicating himself, which was best suited to the particular condition and exigencies of his own case. And had he not accused me of having levelled "*entirely groundless charges*" against the subordinates of the Secretariat, I should have taken no notice of the error into which he falls regarding Mr. Thomas. As it is, I am compelled to state that he MISQUOTES Mr. Malet—I don't say with the object, but with the effect, of making it appear that Mr. Thomas concerned himself

about the letter to an extent which that individual never pretended that he had. Mr. Malet's words at page 1045, are—"Mr. Thomas, the assistant in the Political Department, who brought it to the Chief Secretary, *who* in vain endeavoured to trace, &c."

The very complaint made by both Mr. Frere and myself was that there had been "*no agitation;*" that the betrayal of the deliberations of Government, and the alleged complicity of Mr. Reid with Baba Nafra and Nursoo Punt, were not deemed of sufficient importance to be referred to council, and made the subject of such a stern enquiry as would have corrected the misconceptions regarding Mr. Reid's character which then existed at Baroda. The hand-writing of the letter was a matter of comparatively little importance. If not that of any one in the Political Department, or of any one confidentially employed by a Member of Council, the circumstance only proved that the virtual author had made use of an amanuensis. The question to determine was, WHO INSPIRED THE LETTER? And this question would in all probability have been sharply enough answered if every individual in the Secretariat, from Mr. Thomas downwards, had been suspended until the traitor was discovered.

The plan adopted was *not* calculated to disabuse the native mind of its belief in the corruptibility of Mr. Reid and other functionaries.

Mr. Reid proceeds:—

"Colonel Outram has not, in any part of the Blue Book that I can discover, succeeded in showing that Nursoo Punt was convinced that Mr. Morris was the writer of this letter, or that it was a communication from Mr. Reid. Had he so believed, why was the letter not answered at once? If anything was to be done by Mr. Reid, no time was to be lost; for Nursoo Punt well knew that Mr. Reid was to proceed to England in March. And why did he take no steps whatever till his son Keshow visited Bombay about that period? and even then, none which showed that he entertained such an impression? And in regard to Mr. Morris's complicity in this matter, it is to be observed, that in March 1849, nothing had been discovered; no investigation was going on; Nursoo Punt had apparently gained his object, he was in favor with the acting Resident. The same state of things existed in June 1849. Why, then, should Mr. Morris, if the author of the letter, have hesitated to

declare himself, and to claim his reward for the service he had rendered, instead of voluntarily (for there is nothing to show that he was driven by circumstances to this course,) laying the original letter before the head clerks of the Secretariat, and, through them, before the Chief Secretary." P.P. 51, 52.

Whether "Colonel Outram" has "succeeded in showing" that Nursoo regarded the letter as coming from Mr. Reid, through Mr. Morris, is a question upon which Nursoo's counsel might be supposed anxious to take issue, were that culprit placed at the bar of the Old Bailey; and even in such a case I think the jury would decide in the affirmative. But were it otherwise, it seems strange that an English gentleman, who has held the position of an Indian Governor, and aspires to a seat in the East India Direction, should so utterly disregard the results arrived at by one of the ablest and most upright of the Company's judicial officers, and concurred in by the Board of Control, and by that very Directorial body into which he seeks admission. And it is hardly worthy of a gentleman in such a position to endeavour, at page 51, to sustain an opinion opposed to Mr. Frere's finding, on an *assumption* made at page 50. Still less worthy of him is it to imply, in behalf of the opinion thus unwarrantably supported, what, however unintentionally indulged in, practically amounts to a SUGGESTIO FALSI. "*If anything was to be done by Mr. Reid no time was to be lost;* for "Nursoo Punt well knew that Mr. Reid was to proceed to "England in March." Mr. Reid ought to have seen that the very terms of the letter, and the very circumstances of the case exclude the idea that "*anything was to be done by Mr. Reid.*" Everything *had* been done. Nursoo *had* been reinstated in the office he had betrayed, owing to Mr. Reid's "*cogent arguments.*" He *had* got a triumph over the Fudkey for which it was implied he was indebted to Mr. Reid. He *had* been informed that the departing Mr. Reid had handed him over to the protection of Mr. Willoughby. "Nursoo Punt," to quote Mr. Reid's own words, "HAD APPARENTLY GAINED HIS OBJECT." Except to manifest his gratitude to Mr. Reid, nothing remained to be done. And all that the letter suggested to him was an expression of gratitude,

That he did send a letter, if nothing more, though the missive never reached Mr. Reid, I shall continue to regard as probable, despite the assertions of Nursoo and Mr. Morris. And we know that he *did* send his son to Bombay to pay his respects to the departing councillor.

In reply to the latter portion of Mr. Reid's remarks, I refer to my preceding pages.

Mr. Reid goes on to say:—

"In any unbiassed mind there cannot be a doubt that, by whomsoever this letter was written, Nursoo Punt—who had never in his life received a communication from me—was, from the first, perfectly satisfied that the communication did not come from Mr. Reid, and that Mr. Morris was not the writer; and that, whatever use he may have made of the letter, (and this is a point resting, so far as I can discover, on very doubtful testimony) he knew no more than that it was sent by either an unknown friend or an unknown enemy." P. 52.

After the style of argument previously adopted by Mr. Reid, such a statement as the above can hardly excite surprise—and perhaps barely deserves notice. But perhaps I may be permitted to suggest to Mr. Reid, that it would be convenient if, in the next edition of his Letter, he would explain to us the interpretation that "*any unbiassed mind*" would put on the facts that have been established as to "*the use Nursoo made of the letter.*"

To resume our quotations from Mr. Reid:—

"I commence my remarks on the letter itself, by distinctly and peremptorily declaring, that I never caused any communication to be made to Nursoo Punt; and that I know nothing whatever of the letter in question—notwithstanding Colonel Outram's insinuation in paragraph
1411. 53 of his Khutput Report, Part II., Sec. 3, which can scarcely bear any other construction than that I must have been cognizant of the transaction; a view which is directly at variance with the whole tenor of his usual observations, and particularly with his remarks in para. 5 of
1146. his letter of the 11th November 1851, in which he distinctly cites the Maurrice letter, not as a proof of my having communicated with Nursoo Punt, but as a strong instance of the corruption of the Secretariat." P. 53.

Mr. Reid's "distinct and peremptory declaration" is of course satisfactory. It is the declaration which I myself made on my own responsibility to those who believed Mr. Reid to have

caused the communication to be made to Nursoo Punt. And I made it quite as peremptorily and distinctly as Mr. Reid now has. But this, like all my other indignant declarations in respect of him and others, believed by the natives to be corrupt, fell on incredulous ears. Nor could I wonder that it did so; the circumstances of the case being considered. And as it was of unspeakable importance that the matter should be thoroughly investigated, and that the Court of Directors should know the nature and sources of the popular belief in the corruption of their highest functionaries, I stated the arguments on which the natives based their belief that the letter had *really* been sent by Mr. Reid's directions. And, as I *did* then really believe that Mr. Morris was the writer, and that he had betrayed a confidence reposed in him by Mr. Reid, I did not hesitate to express myself thus:—

"There was no Mr. J. R. Maurrice, but there was a Mr. J. Morris, who was understood to have been a confidential clerk of Mr. Reid's when that gentleman was Secretary in the Revenue Department, and to have been subsequently transferred to a high appointment in the Sudder Adawlut, of which Mr. Reid was ex-officio Chief Judge. The letter was not in the handwriting of this individual; it was evidently written by a purvoe, but, as the phraseology shows, at the dictation of an Englishman: it bears not a trace of native composition; and on the assumption that Mr. Morris, mindful of the maxim, 'Litera scripta manet,' got a native clerk to copy his communication to Nursoo—the erroneous orthography of the signature is susceptible of easy explanation. It may have been an accidental blunder of the amanuensis, who was guided by his ear; or, and this is far the more likely supposition, it may have been designedly adapted with a view to create a loophole for escape, should Nursoo not 'keep the contents of this letter secret,' and thus hereafter imperil his correspondent. The similarity of the two names was sufficiently great to justify Mr. Reid in taking in any letter to the address of 'Mr. J. R. Maurrice,' and handing it to Mr. J. Morris; and it is difficult to conceive that any one, save Mr. Morris, or some one having a secret understanding with him, would have taken the trouble to write such a letter to Nursoo Punt, and to have directed him to send a reply, which the writer of the letter was not destined to see. It is difficult to suppose, as Mr. Morris now alleges, that the letter was written without his cognizance; there was no conceivable object to be attained by such an artifice. The reply which Nursoo was invited to send was almost certain to reach Mr. Morris. That individual, if innocent of the letter which had

elicited the reply, would naturally have submitted the letter to Mr. Reid; an investigation would have taken place, and an investigation instituted at that early date would most probably have resulted in the detection of the writer of the letter; for those in a position to write it, must have been few, and easily identified. The investigation would, at all events, have exonerated Mr. Morris and Mr. Reid, and thus have frustrated the objects of the writer, if in writing the letter he was inspired by any sinister design against these persons; a supposition irreconcileable with the entreaty to keep the contents of this letter secret." B.B. p. 1411.

If there be one word in that extract which is not true, or not pertinent, or which it was not my duty to write, let Mr. Reid point it out. In the meantime I proceed with his arguments—

"The letter is dated the 3rd January 1849. The decision of Government on Nursoo Punt's application to retire, which he was permitted to withdraw, is found in the Governor's minute, signed by Mr. Reid and
1245. Mr. Willoughby, of the 7th October 1848. The whole proceedings of the Government in the cases of Govindrao Guikwar and Guorojee Pol were completed by Mr. Willoughby's minute on the latter, of the 31st December 1848, when, or immediately after which date, the papers returned to the Secretariat. The "Maurrice" letter must have been written after Mr. Willoughby's minute, because it contained matter not to be found in the Governor's and my minute of the 28th December. I allude to the reference made to Furké, as 'not being allowed to have anything to do with Government business—for this is to be found in Mr. Willoughby's minute only. It is clear, then, that the Secretariat was in possession on, or immediately after, the 31st December, 1848—and that no one could have been in possession before—of all the information which enabled some person in the office to write the
1109. letter, or to cause it to be written. And when we find that the actual
1110. minutes of the members of the Government are freely communicated to
1160. those who will pay for them, are we to wonder that such a communication as the 'Maurrice' letter should find its way from the Secretariat; and to think that it could not have been sent without the privity of a member of the Government?" P.P. 53, 54.

I have already (*antea* page 105) shown that, according to Mr. Malet's own statement, no clerk in the Secretariat could have seen Mr. Willoughby's minute till the 3rd of January, the date of the "Maurrice" letter.

Mr. Reid proceeds—

"Suspicion attaches to a Mr. Craig, then a clerk in the Political

Department, whom your accurate correspondent describes as "now a collector or magistrate in the Mofussil." He would, had he taken the trouble to search, have found this man's history in pages 1045, 1083, 1240, 1260, and 1272, and probably in many other places; and he would have learnt, that instead of being "now a collector or magistrate in the Mofussil," he is a denounced fugitive; that he quitted Bombay on leave of absence on the 12th February 1849; that he has not since returned; and that the efforts of the Bombay Government to obtain intelligence respecting him from the other presidencies have failed. He had previously borne a high character, and Mr. Thomas, the head clerk, seems, from the account which he gives of him in his memorandum of the 19th January 1852, to have placed the greatest confidence in him. I confirm Mr. Thomas' statement, and the remark in par. 6 of the Committee's Report, that Mr. Craig was not personally known to me. He never, to my knowledge, was at my house; or had any employment under me; or the slightest intercourse with me. I cannot say I never saw him; because, as he was in the Secretary's office from October 1838, and I was at the head of the same office, though in a different department, till March 1844, he must have passed some time or other before me; but I am not aware that I ever spoke to him in my life. It is surmised—and, considering what has since transpired, with some probability—that he was the author of the anonymous letters sent to Mr. Willoughby and myself in April 1848. P.P. 54, 55. 1272. 1272. 1261.

This elaborate notice of an error of "Indus" committed in his first newspaper articles—*but not occurring in the Pamphlet before the public at the date of the appearance of Mr. Reid's* "Letter"—does not, so far as I can perceive, materially affect the case which Mr. Reid professes to elucidate. But it is decidedly calculated to convey a wrong impression to the reader, by leading him to suppose that Craig was a fugitive, in consequence of the energetic measures taken by Government to bring him to trial. And, in illustration of the unjustifiable manner in which Mr. Reid professes to base his bold assertions on the parliamentary papers, I may mention, that *in not one of the five pages cited by him, is there one single syllable to lead "Indus" to assume that Craig was* "A DENOUNCED FUGITIVE" WHOM THE GOVERNMENT WERE IN SEARCH OF. *

---

*The passage at page 1045 of the Blue Book, cited by Mr. Reid, has been already quoted (*antea* p. 104), and *it* testifies to the fact of our

At page 55, Mr. Reid proceeds:—

"In addition to imparting information from the Minutes of Council, of the communication to be made to the acting Resident regarding Nursoo Punt, the 'Maurrice' letter goes on to warn Nursoo Punt

---

traitor in the Secretariat having been detected and expelled through Craig's exertions. *The citation at page* 1083 *is precisely the same passage occurring at another part of the Blue Book.* The contribution to Craig's "history" at page 1260, is from the Report of a Committee (of Government Secretaries) appointed to investigate how far the subordinates in the Secretariat were censurably concerned in the Baroda intrigues, and in appropriating the money designed for Mr. Reid's hands by Nafra, in 1847. But far from bearing out Mr. Reid's implication, the Secretaries specially tell us that—"*He was never dismissed from his employment, but, in February* 1849, *permitted to proceed on leave to Calcutta; and eventually his name was struck off* ONLY BECAUSE HE HAD NOT RETURNED TO BOMBAY WHEN THE TERM OF HIS LEAVE EXPIRED." The citation at page 1272, is a similar testimony from Mr. Thomas, who says that even after it became known that Craig had maintained an adulterous connection with his wife's sister, he "never once had reason to suspect that he had been guilty of the slightest betrayal of the confidence reposed in him." And the passage referred to at page 1240, is simply a circular letter from Mr. Malet to the Governments of Madras, Bengal, and Agra (dated February 1851), intimating that Mr. Craig's name had been struck off the Secretariat lists on account of his not having returned on the expiry of his leave; and informing them *in case of Mr. Craig applying for Government employment*, that "since his departure, "certain accusations, supported by credible evidence, have been laid "before Government, to the effect that, shortly before leaving Bombay, "he had received a bribe of rupees 10,000, on pretence of being able "to influence certain high official functionaries, &c."

The rupees 10,000, as the reader already knows, had been sent in 1847—not 1848. So it was not on account of *that* transaction that Craig failed to return to Bombay on the expiry of his leave, on the 12th of May, 1849. And his departure and prolonged absence cannot be attributed to any fears about the Maurrice letter, even on the supposition that he was the writer; for he did not leave till the 12th of February, by which time the letter had been upwards of a month in Nursoo's possession, without a word being said of it in public. The exposure of his relations with his sister-in-law, with whom he had been conducting an adulterous intercourse, would account for his failing to return to Bombay.

against enmity to Baba Nafra, and Hurree Bhugtee's firm. This your correspondent terms 'a figment of the Bombay Government and its 'European underlings.' From what part of the Blue Book he obtains this impression, I have not discovered. But it is difficult to comprehend why, if Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra were in alliance, and if the letter were the production of a friend of the former—of one who knew his tactics, and whose object was merely to communicate intelligence which might be of use to him—any such allusion was made." P.P. 55, 56.

The letter stands to answer for itself. And I think the hypothesis made by me in the note to page 84, affords the only reasonable solution of the difficulty. Mr. Reid states he did not receive a private letter from Nursoo—that statement would have been enough had I ever accused him of being the author of the Maurice letter, which I never did. But that the writer of the letter had been led to fear that the simulated hostility of Nursoo and Baba Nafra was real, is obvious. And, in keeping with his customary style of logic, Mr. Reid, in the next paragraph, proceeds to the two "*facts*" (already disposed of *antea*, p. 49) which he deems irreconcileable with "simulated hostility and real friendship." And then continues—

"But, having disclaimed all knowledge of the letter, it is needless for me to pursue this part of the subject, or to do more than state that, till I saw the Blue Book, I never had an insight into the state of parties at Baroda, and therefore, had no knowledge of what individuals were friends or enemies of each other.

"There is one mystery in this 'Maurrice' letter which I am quite unable to unravel, consistently with the assumption that it was written by a friend of Nursoo Punt. I allude to the directions given to send the answer 'by post' to 'Mr. J. R. Maurrice, at Mr. Reid's house, Bombay.' Such instructions involved either a probability of the answer never reaching its destination, or a certainty of discovery. All letters coming to my house from the post office were delivered to my peons, none of whom could read English, and by them to me; had a letter so addressed been brought to me, I should, having nothing to excite my suspicions, have simply returned it to the post office as a misdirected letter. It would have lain in the dead letter office until claimed by some party interested. If, on the other hand, anything had occurred to raise my suspicions, I might have deemed it right to open the letter; when the intrigue would at once have been discovered." PP. 56, 77.

There is indeed a mystery about the letter and the instructions it contained, which did not for long present itself in full force to my mind. When it did, I sought its solution in the belief that Morris, or some one in league with him, had betrayed Mr. Reid's confidence. That solution Mr. Reid denies me. I therefore abstain from approaching the subject. And I would fain say no more about the letter. But Mr. Reid's next paragraph compels me to point out another of those singular misapplications of the Blue Books, of which I have already furnished more than one instance. Thus he writes in continuance of the words above quoted:—

"Colonel Outram disposes summarily of this view of the question by saying that, 'to suppose that the letter was written out of enmity to 'Nursoo is simply absurd.' He seems to have found it difficult to admit a view which would have told so much in favour of an opponent. He knows, in his heart, that I had no more to do with the 'Maurrice' letter than he had himself. How then can he reconcile the directions given as to the address, with the assumption that they were given by a friend of Nursoo Punt? And has he not had sufficient experience of Indian intrigue to have learnt, that there is no artifice, however deep, to which a wily Brahmin (a class to which Furké, as well as Nursoo Punt, belongs, and whose character he himself well describes in p. 965,) will not resort in order to gain his object? And what would have been more damning to Nursoo Punt's character than the discovery that he had answered a communication, such as the 'Maurrice' letter, in such a way as to show a disposition to enter into a base intrigue?" P.P. 57, 58.

To enable the reader to judge of the accuracy of the assertion hazarded by Mr. Reid, in the opening sentence of the foregoing quotation, I subjoin what "Colonel Outram" *really did say:*—

"To suppose that the letter was written out of enmity to Nursoo, as that individual has since pretended, is simply absurd. *The letter was a kind one; it combined early and authentic information with sound advice. Nursoo took good care to have it displayed in quarters where it was his object to create a belief that his influence in Bombay was paramount; and he never submitted it to any of his superiors, as he undoubtedly would have done, had he regarded it as an invention of the enemy.*" B.B. p. 1411.

The fine sense of propriety which prompts Mr. Reid to describe Nursoo Punt as my "OPPONENT" (as he has elsewhere called him my "ANTAGONIST") requires—at least it shall receive—no comment at my hands. Nor shall I attempt to deprecate the delicate

insinuation which the sentence conveys. And as I have before said, the peculiar line of argument which Mr. Reid has adopted as necessary to his defence—his unflinching faith in Nursoo's honesty—his bold assertion of Mr. Morris' purity—his unqualified declaration that no reply was sent to the Maurrice letter—and the statement which I accept, that Mr. Morris never was in a position to betray his confidence, invest the question with personal embarrassments which I do not choose to encounter. I did my best to solve the mystery. Its solution is now in Mr. Reid's hands, and affects him, and him only. But I may be permitted to observe, that Mr. Reid displays his usual infelicity of citation in referring with applause to page 965 of the Blue Book. The cited passage is one in which, in the course of the first of my fruitless appeals against the measures of 1848, founded on Mr. Reid's cogent arguments, I pointed out considerations which should have made the Government ponder ere they assumed, that because Nursoo had never been convicted of dishonesty as a Revenue servant, he must necessarily have remained pure after his transference, in a political capacity, to so vile a sink of iniquity as Baroda.*

---

* I subjoin the passage:—

"The distinction which Nursoo Luxmon had gained in the service of Government, and the high reward of the village grant for three lives, which had been conferred on him by the Honourable the Court of Directors, might well be considered a guarantee for a continuance of upright conduct; and this integrity might probably have been preserved, had he not in an evil hour been tempted to abandon the Revenue Department, where little opportunity for lawless gain is offered, and greater risk is incurred, for a political office at Baroda, which affords so wide a field for corruption, and from which it was notorious that his predecessors had reaped a rich harvest of illicit gains. With my own countrymen, and I hope with some classes of the natives of India, a sense of honour, gratitude, and pride of character, would, under such circumstances, deter an official servant from yielding to temptation, *but I reluctantly allow that my long acquaintance* (32 *years*) *with the Brahminical class, to which Nursoo Luxmon belongs, has taught me that few indeed among them are swayed by such feelings. And it is my opinion, derived from the long experience referred to, that there are few of the class*

Mr. Reid's next paragraph contains a rather melancholy wind-up to his bold and uncompromising advocacy of Nursoo, and to his reiterated assertions as to the light in which that upright servant regarded the letter.

"I do not contend that Nursoo Punt acted as he ought to have done in respect to this letter. It was his duty, the instant he received it, to have laid it before the acting Resident, or to have sent it to me. His having adopted neither of these courses exposes himself to the imputation of not possessing that honesty and straightforwardness which his long intercourse with English gentlemen of honour and education *ought to have instilled into him.** I am surprised to find that when, in the mon-

---

of whom I speak in whose minds such considerations would preponderate against the gratification of their avarice; for this is a gratification incapable of enhancement in Brahminical estimation, save by the excitement of the intrigue by which it is obtained. Of the moral depravity and want of principle charged upon this class of natives, I am in a position to furnish many instances. Suffice it for the present to adduce the case of one, also in the service of Government, *who having like Nursoo Punt, been raised, trusted, and rewarded, is an apt illustration of the degrading fact I have alleged.* Sarabhaee, who for 20 years held the same post in this office which was recently vacated by Nursoo Punt, retired from the service in high honour and favour. Not only did he receive a handsome pension, and possess the esteem and friendship of the European gentlemen under whom he had served, to fully as great an extent as Nursoo Luxmon boasts of, but, like Nursoo, he was further rewarded by the grant of a village, conferred on him by the British Government, and through the special favour of the latter, was permitted to retain similar favours bestowed upon him by the Guicowar and other native chieftains; *yet some years afterwards, it was found that he had been grossly corrupt and dishonest throughout the period of his supposed faithful service.* Proofs of this were furnished to Government, in 1837, by Mr. Malet, then Officiating Resident, and similar proofs even at this day, I have no doubt, I could furnish, if required to do so. Of his guilt Mr. Sutherland, Political Commissioner, had no doubt, and that gentleman, in his letter of the 5th April 1838 (256), proposed to establish it by legal evidence, in one at least of the several cases in which Sarabhaee's treachery seemed to him more than presumable."

* Why! Mr. Reid, throughout, assumes that Nursoo was honest from the very first, and so honest that five years residence in that "sink of iniquity" failed to contaminate him, despite his own anticipations that it would.

soon of 1849, the 'Maurrice' letter was laid before the Chief Secretary, Nursoo Punt was not asked for an explanation of his motive in so long concealing it; and, when making it known at all, *doing so by referring only to Mr. Morris, instead of to the superiors of his own department.* His conduct on this occasion affords an apt illustration of native character." P. 55.

Comment would be superfluous.

The next two pages are occupied with a condensed iteration of the "arguments" I have just disposed of, and which are reproduced in the form of a rejoinder to some of the allegations of "Indus." Having to this extent given additional mistification to the real questions at issue, Mr. Reid proceeds to sum up his own proceedings in the case of Nursoo Punt.

"I have above fully explained my own part in interfering (the only case in which I ever did so) in supporting Nursoo Punt against what I then* deemed (and a careful perusal of everything relating to this point has in no way altered my opinion) unjust treatment. I cannot assent to Colonel Outram's view,—which gives a colour to his correspondence throughout page after page of the Blue Book,—THAT IT WAS THE SOLE DUTY OF THE BOMBAY GOVERNMENT TO CARRY OUT HIS WISHES AND OBEY HIS SUGGESTIONS TO THE LETTER; AND THAT IT WAS A CRIME TO HESITATE TO ACT AS HE DESIRED, EVEN IF HIS DESIRES MIGHT SEEM OPPOSED TO ALL LAW AND JUSTICE. I had no reliance on his infallibility; and believed it my duty to weigh every case which he thought fit to lay before the Government, as I would those of any other subordinate officer. I had seen many *similar cases* wherein native servants had been ruined by cabals fostered by the *credulity, prejudice, want of temper and discretion, of European officers;* and (as I have already stated) there was nothing apparent, at the time, to lead to the belief that this was other than *an ordinary case of this nature;* differing in fact from others only in that the native officer, whose conduct formed the subject of discussion, was a man hitherto of extraordinarily high character. By my *imputed* interference in this case, and my not consenting to leave Furké in undisputed sovereignty over Baroda affairs, when Colonel Outram proceeded to Egypt (THOUGH, IN FACT, I HAD NO MORE CONCERN IN THIS THAN ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT,) I have drawn down upon myself the enmity of a strong and violent party, who have not hesitated

* The only case in which he ever had an opportunity; as it was the first time Nursoo's conduct had been impeached by an official superior.

in my absence, to resort to all means short of actual accusation of corruption, including appeals to the local press, to cast a slur upon my character." P.P. 60, 61.

After what has been detailed in the preceding pages, to attempt to show that my views were as widely dissimilar from those attributed to me by Mr. Reid, as his elaborate vindication of Nursoo was from the merits of the case, would be to insult the understanding of my readers. I confine myself, therefore, to a flat and emphatic denial of the accuracy of his assertions, and to a declaration of my belief, that Mr. Reid will not find any three gentlemen of the Athenæum Club, who will not tell him that his allegations are as devoid of foundation as his assertion that he, whose "cogent arguments" overcame Lord Falkland's belief of Nursoo's guilt, had no more to do with the invitation given to him to remain in the office he had betrayed, than any other member of Government. As flatly do I deny that I bore Mr. Reid any "enmity"—that I leagued myself with any party, whether "strong and violent" or feeble and forbearing—that I directly or indirectly took part in, sanctioned, or was privy to, a single "appeal to the local press," or, that I in any way, or at any time, or under any circumstances, attempted to cast a slur on his character. That character I had sought to vindicate; for I believed it to have suffered from a series of events for which Mr. Reid was little responsible. From first to last I expressed my belief in Mr. Reid's purity. And as Mr. Reid knows, I have been held up to ridicule by his critic "Indus" for maintaining that belief.

Mr. Reid's present disagreeable position entitles him to great latitude. And I am willing to believe that his erroneous assertions are not deliberate misstatements. But their denial and refutation are required of me. Mr. Reid must consent to submit to both the one and the other. And it rests with him to show, by the prompt acknowledgement and withdrawal of his epithets, insinuations, and charges here and elsewhere noticed, that the concessions I have volunteered in his behalf are not unworthily bestowed.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LETTERS RECEIVED BY MESSRS REID AND WILLOUGHBY.

I have already alluded to certain letters already received by Messrs. Reid and Willoughby, in April 1848, intimating to them that it would be to their advantage to secure a Government decision in favor of the bank of Hurree Bhugtee (that is Baba Nafra), in a case then pending, or about to come, before them. And to these letters I devote my present Chapter, with the view of enabling the reader to determine how far Mr. Reid is justified in accusing me of having made a "tortuous" use of them.

The man in whose favor an interested decision was thus boldly solicited, had been denounced in former years for his disgraceful (and unhappily too successful) attempts to corrupt the native establishment of the Baroda Residency. He had been concerned in the design entertained by the Guicowar, in 1840, to buy up Sir James Carnac's Government, and to administer a bribe of £6,000 to Mr. Reid himself. From him it was that Nursoo Punt (according to Mr. Frere, the Court of Directors, and the Board of Control,) lies under the "*painful suspicion*" of having received a bribe of £2,000 in May 1845, to influence the Resident's judgment, in a case in which the Bank was interested.* The same man it was who, in July 1847, with the cognizance of Nursoo Punt, sent to Bombay the agent who is proved to have given away large sums of money, ostensibly intended for Mr. Reid's hands. It

* Bechur Samul, the principal partner of the bank, did not die till September 1845; but Baba Nafra had been long the Moonim, or chief manager, of the bank. Through him all bribes were paid, and in his house were found the papers which exposed the transaction.

was the frauds and extortions of this very man that Nursoo Punt was convicted by Mr. Frere of having criminally endeavoured to conceal, in August 1848—convicted be it remembered, in the teeth of those "cogent arguments" by which Mr. Reid had previously secured him a more than honourable acquittal. It was from this same man, that Nursoo Punt labours under "*the strongest suspicions*" of having, about the 19th or 20th of October 1848, received a reward of £2,800, for aiding and abetting in the persecutions of Joitabhae. And it was with a view to promote the same nefarious plot, of the same nefarious man, that, according to the judgment of the Directors and the Board of Control—"*there is ample ground of moral conviction, that*" this Nursoo Punt, whose reputation is dear to Mr. Reid, "*misinformed Captain French, as he has been clearly proved to have misinformed Colonel Outram.*"

The fact of such letters having been addressed both to Mr. Reid and Mr. Willoughby, was communicated to me by the latter gentleman, soon after my return from Egypt, in the beginning of 1850. Before I left for Egypt, in November 1848, Mr. Willoughby, or his son-in-law Mr. Malet, had informed me that an agent of Baba Nafra had presumed to offer "*Poshauks,*" that is, presents of cloths, &c., to the ladies of the family. In both cases, the circumstances were mentioned to me as indicating "*the impudence*" of Nafra. And the impression left on my mind was, that the letters had been smuggled in amongst the "Poshauks." In this it appears I was wrong.* The letters were sent through the post, in addition to the "Poshauks," which had been sent by an agent.

When, in July 1850, on my examination of Nafra's accounts, I discovered that money had been sent to Bombay, and that there

* My mistake was not pointed out till after Mr. Chapman had, in his "*Baroda and Bombay,*" stated the circumstance in conformity with my impressions. As Mr. Willoughby still retains the letter sent to him, I solicited permission to examine it, and should have wished to incorporate it in this Pamphlet. Mr. Willoughby, however, declined to place the letter before me, on the ground that by so doing he would constitute himself a partizan.

was a likelihood of a clue being found as to its distribution, if a prompt seizure were made of the papers of Nafra's Bombay agent, I wrote a private and confidential note to Mr. Malet, requesting him to take steps to secure so desirable an object. This note (dated 13th July,) is published in the Blue Book as a "*demi-official letter*"—and is to be found at page 1216. I take the liberty of subjoining it.

"The delay which Baba Nafra's people managed to interpose before his Highness could get the chopras from them, was made good use of in falsifying many items; but though the names of the parties to whom the money was given had thus been obliterated, the business was so hastily and clumsily done as to leave no doubt as to the object of those debits; and from first to last between three or four lakhs of rupees, belonging to Hurree Bhugtee's firm, have been made away with by the Baba, to defeat enquiry into the Joetabhaee affair, during the four years the tukrar has been going on. Among other items are two for a lakh of rupees given in September or October 1848 (one of 85,000, the other of 15,000), the latter of which is supposed to have been given to Nursoo Punt, and the former to have been sent to Bombay, with a view to defeat my exposure of the Govind Rao Gaekwar and Gorajee Pol frauds, on which I reported at the end of August and beginning of September of that year. The agent employed in Bombay is now here, whose examination I took yesterday, a rough translate of which I enclose. The fellow admits only to have had 22,000 rupees, but is believed to have taken the whole 85,000, which doubtless he made appear to have been expended much in the same way the rascals did in the Dhakjee Dadajee affair of 1840; and I think a complete exposure of their villany would be effected by securing the papers which he left with his brother-in-law in Bombay, which I should hope there would be no difficulty in doing, if you were to put the police magistrate on the scent without delay."

"I recollect either you or Willoughby telling me, shortly before I went to Egypt, of an agent of Baba Nafra's having had the impertinence to endeavour to present Poshauks to the madams, for which the fellow was sent to the right-about with a flea in his ear. I dare say it will be found that he pretended to have expended the money in that manner, if so, we now, I hope, have an opportunity of exposing the rascally contrivances by which such fellows have made people up here believe in the efficacy of 'khutput in Bombay.'

"I write in haste to save the post."

This letter reached Mr. Malet on the 17th of July. He

immediately put it into circulation, recommending that "if it be determined to comply with Colonel Outram's suggestion, orders be immediately given, as without doubt Bulwunt Row will have been written to from Baroda on the subject, so that any delay will defeat the chances of success." Lord Falkland was in the Deccan, and Mr. Willoughby lost no time in writing the following minute:

"THERE can be no doubt that it is highly desirable that malpractices of the kind alluded to by Lieutenant-Colonel Outram should be exposed, and if possible punished, but it is exceedingly difficult to effect this in Bombay. I think the Chief Secretary should be authorised to communicate confidentially with the Advocate General, and obtain his advice, as to whether any, and if so, what measures can be adopted to secure Bulwunt Row's papers. As calculated to throw some light on the subject, *and in corroboration of Lieutenant-Colonel Outram's surmises that the firm of Hurree Bhugtee*, OR RATHER I SHOULD SAY BABA NAFRA, *have sent money to Bombay under the pretext of bribing men in authority*, I circulate an anonymous note which I received, dated the 10th April 1848, and which, if I recollect right, I mentioned at the time in Council, and ascertained that my late esteemed colleague, Mr. Reid, had received an exactly similar communication. It will be observed that this letter addressed to me was enclosed under a cover addressed to my daughter, and *I think it must have been drawn up by some unprincipled and corrupt European, in league with the party at Baroda.*" B.B. 1217.*

As we shall see in the next Chapter, the only light I was able to throw on this subject, was that obtained through the exertions of my able and excellent friend, Captain Barr, the Paymaster General. In the meantime, it will be observed, not only that Mr. Malet and Mr. Willoughby acquiesced in—for they questioned not—what I had said about the "Poshauks;" but that the latter

---

* In the Blue Books the minute is mispunctuated, and runs thus:—"I think the Chief Secretary should be authorized to communicate "confidentially with the Advocate General, and obtain his advice, as to "whether any, and if so, what measures can be adopted to secure Bul-"wunt Row's papers, as calculated to throw light on the subject, and in "corroboration, by Lieutenant-Colonel Outram's surmises, &c." I think my reader will admit that the punctuation given in the text is the reasonable one; and that I am as fully authorized to adopt it as to alter the "*by*" which precedes my own name into "*of*."

circulated, in corroboration of my surmises regarding Nafra's attempts at bribery, the letter which he had previously mentioned to me as illustrating the "*impudence*" of that man.

This minute was recorded on the 17th of July 1850. But it was in vain that Mr. Willoughby recorded, from time to time, the importance and duty of assisting my enquiries. All assistance was withheld from me; and as the minutes of Government prove —*minutes unseen by me till the publication of the Blue Books, but duly communicated to the Baroda corruptionists by the traitors in the Secretariat*—my investigations continued to be regarded by the Government with displeasure. Every proceeding of that Government tended more and more to confirm the belief of the natives that Mr. Reid's friends in power viewed my enquiries with alarm; and I was daily more and more embarrassed by the daily increasing conviction of those among whom I had to exercise my functions, that they could not more effectually secure the favour of the authorities than by throwing difficulties in my way. In April 1851, deeming it necessary to make an earnest appeal to Government, with a view to induce them to alter a policy which had produced such melancholy results, I sent in my "Statement of Facts, relative to Nursoo Punt" (BB. p. 1054); and in that document, while avowing my firm belief in the integrity of my superiors, I deemed it my duty to show them that they could hardly expect the natives to recognize that integrity in the face of the very "unhappy concatenation of circumstances," as Mr. Frere has termed it. After reciting many of these circumstances, and pointing out the very sad effects produced on the minds of the natives by the "Maurrice letter," I thus proceeded:—

"The intimation thus conveyed by Nursoo's correspondent, that Mr. Reid was the author of the minute on which the Government decision had been founded, must have received ready credence from those who found that the decision of Government was in exact accordance with the terms of his letter. And there is nothing, as Government are well aware, relating to Baroda matters, that takes place in the Secretariat, that does not find its way to this place, just as there are no matters of importance transacted in my own office that do not find their way to the city of Baroda, and to the Bombay friends of the Baroda traders in corruption.

"From the turn which matters have now taken, it will, I think, be matter of regret to Government that there was no condemnatory allusion to the letter which I have previously alluded to as having been sent to Mr. Reid, intimating to that gentleman that it would be to his advantage to secure decisions in support of that firm; *such an allusion would have greatly facilitated my recent inquiries, and would have enabled me to assure the natives, with some chance of being believed, that the decision of Government was arrived at in spite of, and not in consequence of, the absurd but wicked attempt to corrupt a member of Council.*

"Another circumstance calculated to strengthen the belief that it was through Mr. Reid's agency that the Government decisions under allusion were obtained, is the fact, of which Government have long been aware, that Nursoo's relative, Baba Nafra, did actually send an emissary to bribe that member of Council, and that the emissary in question actually paid away large sums, which he believed, or pretended to believe, to have reached Mr. Reid's hands." B.B., p. 1062.

In October 1851, I forwarded my report on the circumstances which had tended to create the belief, so universal at Baroda, of the corruptibility of the highest functionaries. In framing that report I deemed it my duty to leave nothing untold which was requisite to enable the Court of Directors (from whom the Bombay Government had withheld my appeals) to judge of the nature and propriety of those official obstructions which had been thrown in my way. And in summarizing the circumstances which induced the natives to believe, that the retention of Nursoo as native agent, and the refusal to annul the Hurree Bhugtee guarantee, in 1848, were the results of corrupt influence in the Council chamber, I thus expressed myself:—

"How long they remained in that gentleman's hands, I cannot, of course, say. But, on my departure for Egypt, they had been in the possession of Government, the first exactly eight, the second seven weeks; and six weeks after my departure Government promulgated a decision, which, while it admitted that the house of Hurree Bhugtee had attempted to defraud an individual enjoying the British protection, to the extent of nearly three lacks of rupees, passed over in perfect silence the charge which I had brought against the firm, of constructive forgery; took no notice of letters which had been sent to the two members of Council intimating that it would be for their benefit to promote the interests of the bank; and withheld the only punishment in the power of Government to inflict, for the attempt at extortion of which the bank

had been guilty, viz., the annulment of the mischief-working guarantee." Para. 37, Sec. III. Part II. of Khutput Report, B.B. p. 1406.

And to this I appended the following note:—

"What the particular case was to which those letters referred, I am not in a position to state; but I know, from the written statements of Mr. Willoughby, that such letters were sent both to himself and his brother councillor, Mr. Reid. Mr. Willoughby duly recorded this insolent proceeding, and, doubtless, Mr. Reid did the same; but it is unfortunate that no reference was made to these letters in the Government despatches of the 12th and 4th January, to satisfy Baba Nafra, the manager of the bank, and those who were aware of the letter he had caused to be written, that the gentleness displayed by Government, in reference to the bank's proceedings, was manifested in spite of, not in consequence of, these letters.

I cannot at present lay my hands on other references to the same letters, though probably there are several in my other despatches; for I deemed it my duty, not less to the Government and its former member, Mr. Reid, than to the impugned honor of my country, to have all these painful matters cleared up so effectually as to satisfy the natives of Baroda, that their British rulers viewed any attempts to influence their judgment by improper means, with indignation and loathing. Yet Mr. Reid, who should have been the first to thank me for bringing to the notice of my superiors aught tending, however unjustly, to compromise his own character in the eyes of the natives, accuses me at page 18 of his Letter, of having referred to these letters "*sometimes not very fairly.*" And at page 19 he proceeds to illustrate his meaning by a partial quotation from the passages I have just given *in extenso.* He thus writes:—

"These letters, and more particularly that addressed to me, are frequently alluded to in the proceedings subsequent to Colonel Outram's return from Egypt; and all the use that can, however tortuously, be made of them, has been so. Colonel Outram says, in his Khutput Report, Part, II. Sec. III., par. 37, that he procured information of their existence from Mr. Willoughby's 'written statements,' and again (in p. 1406, note) 'Mr. Willoughby duly recorded this insolent proceeding, 'and doubtless Mr. Reid did the same.' To what written statements of Mr. Willoughby Colonel Outram had access, (for his minutes as a

member of Council could not have been legitimately known) I cannot find. Mr. Willoughby did not, any more than myself, place anything on record at the time of the receipt of these letters, contenting himself, as I did, with mentioning the fact at a subsequent meeting of the Board. But on the 17th July 1850, long after I had left India, I find that he circulated the original note he had received, with a minute alluding to the fact of my having received a similar note, and my having mentioned this in Council at the time when he did. An account of this transaction will be found in the Chief Secretary's memorandum of the 22nd January, 1852." P. 19.

Mr. Reid's charge of "tortuosity" I simply deny;—emphatically—and without qualification. The "written statements" of Mr. Willoughby were contained in his replies to some queries I addressed to him on the subject of the letters, when my discoveries at Baroda induced me to think I was on the eve of throwing light on the subject. Mr. Willoughby's minute, as cited by Mr. Reid, has been already given; and the reader may judge for himself how far its purport is faithfully condensed by Mr. Reid. And Mr. Secretary Malet's "account," though professedly written to elucidate the "Statement of Facts" which was received by Government in April 1851, was not prepared till the end of January 1852, some weeks after Government had been in possession of the report in which Mr. Frere had deplored the "unhappy concatenation of circumstances" that had marked the proceedings in Nursoo's case, and in which he had intimated that the natives of Baroda were "*so distrustful of the higher, or indeed the highest, officials in Bombay, that they send agents there, and allow themselves to be persuaded that these men obtain corrupt influence over, and information from, men high in office in Bombay.*"

Mr. Malet's account I subjoin:

"The Chief Secretary is aware that, as stated by Colonel Outram in his 30th para., both Mr. Reid and Mr. Willoughby received anonymous letters sent to them, addressed *through* the ladies of their families, requesting their support for Hurree Bughtee's claim in the dispute between that firm and the sons of the late Gungadhur Shastree. The Chief Secretary can also state, from personal communication with those gentlemen, that so far from there being, as Colonel Outram states, "no doubt from whom it came," there was no clue whatever at the time to

trace the letters. The Chief Secretary now believes that Craig was the author of these letters; *but this belief arises from the discovery of the baseness of that man's character and actions, made subsequently to that period.* It will be in the recollection of the Right Honourable the Governor, that Mr. Willoughby *produced in Council the letter which he had received*, and that Mr. Reid mentioned at the same time that one of a similar nature had been sent to him, and that no clue to the writer of them could be discovered." B.B., p. 1082.

When Mr. Malet wrote that there was "*no clue whatever at the time to trace the letters*," he states a complex proposition, *viz.*: that the letters were anonymous, and that the handwriting was not recognised by himself, Mr. Reid, or Mr. Willoughby. But to the careless reader the words might suggest a meaning inconsistent with truth. They suggest the idea that *some* efforts were made to trace the writer. And they are likely to convey the erroneous impression that Mr. Willoughby doubted the source whence his letter derived its inspiration. But as either he or Mr. Malet told me about the "Poshauks" in 1848; as Mr. Willoughby told me of the letter in 1850; and as in both cases the circumstances were mentioned in illustration of Nafra's impudence, it is obvious that Mr. Malet could not have intended to convey what would have been an untrue impression. And the supposition is the less tenable, inasmuch as he refers to the minute in which Mr. Willoughby cites the letter received in April 1848, "in confirmation of Lieut. "Colonel Outram's surmises that *the firm of Hurree Bhugtee, or "rather Baba Nafra, has sent money to Bombay under the pretext "of bribing men in authority.*" But even were it otherwise, it is evident that Mr. Malet wrote his memorandum in haste, or in too great reliance on a treacherous memory. Mr. Willoughby, whose retentive memory, methodical habits, and careful preservation and docketing of papers, &c., are well known to his friends, merely says that he "*mentioned*" in Council the receipt of such a letter. And the whole context of his minute implies that he submitted the original to his colleagues for the first time, on the 17th of July 1850. In this view of the case Mr. Reid concurs at page 19 (previously quoted), where he says that Mr.

Willoughby "*contented himself as I* (Mr. Reid) *did, with mentioning* the fact." Yet Mr. Malet represents him as having produced it in Council at the time.*

Who the individual was that acted on Nafra's behalf on this occasion, forwarding anonymous letters to Messrs. Reid and Willoughby, under cover to ladies of their families, is a matter of minor importance. It *may* have been, that Mr. Craig, who had in 1847 received money to give to Mr. Reid, or it may not. But that the letters were sent, and that the letter addressed to Mr. Willoughby was regarded by him as coming under instructions from Nafra, there can, I think, be little doubt. At all events, it is plain that I had adequate reasons, for supposing that no doubt existed on the minds of those most nearly interested in the matter. Yet Mr. Reid, writing in 1853, and with all the revelations of the Blue Books in painful plainness before him, does not hesitate to express a very different opinion. At page 19 he writes, in continuation of the remarks previously quoted:—

"Under the view which I have ever taken of anonymous communications, I deemed these letters at the time to be of not the slightest importance, knowing them to be utterly powerless in influencing our deci-
1082 sion in any matter that might come before us. There was, as stated by the Chief Secretary, no clue whatever to trace their origin. To Col. Outram, however, nothing was impossible. He at once "had no doubt
1058 from whom it came,"—that is, the letter sent to my house;— and he probably had no greater doubt in respect to that sent to Mr. Wil-

* At page 19, Mr. Reid says "both Mr. Willoughby and myself mentioned the receipt of those letters at a subsequent council. Mr. Willoughby produced (and now has) that sent to him. *Mine I afterwards* destroyed as useless." I find that in an earlier minute, Mr. Malet (27th August 1851, B.B., p. 1249) "ventured to recall to Lord "Falkland's recollection that the Honourable Mr. Willoughby received "an anonymous letter, requesting his interest for the firm of Hurree "Bhugtee, which that gentleman brought to Council, and that Mr. Reid "at that time stated, that he also had received a similar anonymous "letter." But at this date he hints no doubt of the accuracy of my assumption that the letter came, and was recognized as coming, under the instructions of Nafra.

loughby; although my name is here, as elsewhere, for obvious reasons, prominently brought to notice. He decides peremptorily that Baba Nafra had "caused it to be written," and treats this throughout as an indisputable fact. 1406 (note.)

The "obvious reasons" which induced me to make more frequent allusion to the name of Mr. Reid than to that of Mr. Willoughby, were, that the decisions complained of—subsequently proved to have been decisions that should never have been given—were supposed by the natives to have been obtained through the corrupt influence *not* of Mr. Willoughby, *but* of Mr. Reid. Mr. Willoughby, it is true, is my friend—a kind and much valued friend. He long has been, and, I hope, will long continue to be so. But, as the Blue Books show, no considerations based on our private friendship, have ever induced me to slur his name over when it appeared my duty to give it prominence. And, as Mr. Reid was well aware, I never intimated, for I did not believe, that the anonymous letters influenced, or could have influenced, his judgment any more than that of Mr. Willoughby; but I did think, *and I still think*, that they should not have been forgotten when, six or eight months afterwards, the guarantee question came before Government.

In continuation of the remarks above quoted, Mr. Reid proceeds to express his belief that, *even in* 1853, *there is no ground for assuming that the letters were written under instructions from Baba Nafsa.* He thus writes:—

"Now, even on this point, it is just as likely that he may be in error, as that he may be right. If the Shastree's son, or any opponent of the firm, wished to prejudice the members of the Government, or others with whom the ultimate decision of a dispute rested, against the firm, he could not do so more effectually than by sending such letters; for their obvious effect would be to create in the minds of such parties a feeling of indignation at the attempt made to corrupt them. On my guard against such a trick, I cared little whether the letter came from the one or the other party; satisfied that, when any case came before me, I could judge it on its merits, with strict impartiality, and without reference to the artifices of either disputant." P. 20.

Had the Baroda Blue Books not been published, Mr. Reid might have had some excuse for arguing on the hypothesis that

the natives of Baroda, firmly assured of the integrity of himself and his colleagues, must have been aware that the "*obvious effect*" of such letters would be "*to create in the minds of such parties a feeling of indignation at the attempt made to corrupt them.*" But Mr. Reid has been made aware, on other authority than mine, that the natives of Baroda did *not* believe in the integrity of himself and his colleagues; that they considered the highest functionaries open to corrupt influences; and that they regulated their procedure accordingly. Nay, he himself admits (p. 64), that "*no one would attempt to deny * * * the belief in* 'KHUTPUT' *which Colonel Outram has striven with so much zeal to expose*"—that "KHUTPUT" being illicit influence over high Bombay functionaries. He is well aware, that the belief in "Khutput" has been greatly fostered by the fact that neither he nor his colleagues took any steps to show that they viewed the intrigues of the corruptionists with "*indignation.*" And he knows that in the opinion of Mr. Frere, the Court of Directors, and Board of Control, Nursoo Punt lies under "*painful suspicions*" of having accepted a bribe from Nafra of £2000, to influence the judgment of the Resident in this very case of the Shastree's sons, in those preliminary investigations which preceded by three years the letters that were sent to himself and Mr. Willoughby.

Mr. Reid thus winds up his remarks on these letters:—

106 note) "Col. Outram's observation, that the Government ought to have assumed (without a shadow of proof, be it remarked) that Baba Nafra had caused these anonymous letters to be written; and that, when it passed a decision not adverse to the firm (though I have shown elsewhere that in the case to which he alludes, that of Govindrao Guikwar, the decision of Government was adverse—more so than Col. Outram had himself proposed in some points, although it did not withdraw the British guarantee), it should have informed the firm that such decision was passed "in spite of, and not in consequence of," certain anonymous letters received many months before, and having reference to a totally different case, is too absurd to require further comment." PP. 20, 21.

ide page of this tter.

I have already placed before the reader the passage in which Mr. Reid professes to have found the observations "*too absurd to require further comment.*" And on a reference to them it will be

seen that the "observations" are indebted for their existence to the fertile imagination of Mr. Lestock Robert Reid. I did *not* observe that Government "ought to have assumed" that Baba Nafra had caused these letters to be written. In April 1851, I alluded to the letters as having been sent by Baba Nafra, because Mr. Willoughby's communications left on my mind a strong conviction that he regarded them as coming from that man. And in October of the same year, I alluded to them as coming from Baba Nafra with all the more confidence, as neither Mr. Malet nor Mr. Willoughby had, after the perusal of my April report, hinted to me officially or privately that any doubt existed, or ever could have existed on the subject. In April 1851, I believed that the letters were written in reference to the Govind Row case. I had not, however, been informed of the case to which they did relate; and, as the reader has seen, I stated in the "Note" from which Mr. Reid professes to quote, that "I was not in a position to state the particular case to which the letters referred"—adding, however, that as such letters *had* been received, "it was unfortunate that no reference had been made to them in the Government despatches of the 4th and 12th of January 1849." As regards Mr. Reid's extraordinary parenthesis, I have simply to refer the reader to a preceding portion of this Pamphlet (p.p. 43, 44), where I have fully disposed of his allegations.

CHAPTER VII.

THE BRIBE, INTENDED FOR MR. REID.

The next of Mr. Reid's allegations and insinuations to be noticed, are those in which he indulges when endeavouring to rebut the charge of "Indus," based on the fact that a large sum sent by Baba Nafra to Bombay, was represented by Nafra's agent to have been paid to Mr. Reid.

In the foregoing Chapter, I have given the confidential note which I addressed to Mr. Malet on the 13th of July 1850, so soon as I had obtained the first clue to this transaction. I have stated that Mr. Malet lost no time in "circulating" my note, and that Mr. Willoughby, with equal promptitude, wrote the minute given at page 132. Mr. Blane "had no objections." And the reference was made to the Advocate General, whose legal opinion I subjoin:—

"The papers referred to cannot be legally seized except under civil process; if the transactions relate to mere money demands and accounts, or if any crime is involved by any criminal falsification of accounts, or the like, then under criminal process on information on oath laid before a magistrate.

(Signed) A. S. LE MESURIER,
"Malabar Hill, 17th July, 1850. Advocate-General."
—BB. p. 1218.

On receipt of this "minute" Mr. Malet intimated to me that the Advocate General had "given it as his opinion that this seizure cannot be legally effected"—an unfortunate mistake, as I could have furnished information on oath both as to the falsification of accounts, and other matters, which would have justified the seizure.

In the meantime, I had procured further disclosures from

Joteshwur, the agent that had been sent to Bombay. He avowed that he had given £1,000 to a Mr. Craik (subsequently identified as Mr. Craig) to be given to Mr. Reid. When asked if he pretended that he had any personal transactions with Mr. Reid, he said that he had called at Mr. Reid's house, but distinctly denied that he had spoken to him about the money which was afterwards given on his account to Craig, and mentioned that his conversation had been confined to personal enquiries, &c. When interrogated as to the case for which money was sent, his reply was—"There were at that time several cases pending connected with "the firm, *viz.*, regarding Joitabhae's child, and the Shastree's "dispute, and four or five other matters; and the money was "given with a view to gain favor." When asked if a man named Bhanabhae, who had also, it appeared, been sent to Bombay to give presents to ladies and gentlemen, was associated with him in his mission—he replied:—

"Bhanabhae was sent to Bombay a year before me, but as he was not depended upon, I was sent in his place, and he recalled to Baroda. *Baba Nafra taxed me with having expended ten thousand rupees to no purpose, but I replied, that the Guarantee case had been settled, at any rate.*"

To this man's testimony I attached considerable importance. For I had got possession of certain of his papers, sent to me by the Durbar. On telling him that I intended to examine them in his presence, to see what light they threw on his mission to Bombay, he became greatly agitated; declaring that they contained nothing relative to that point, but admitting that they referred to the interests of the corrupt Nagurs who had been expelled from office in 1837-38, and whose "Gooroo," or spiritual adviser, he had been. I told him that they should be sealed up and returned to him unopened, should subsequent investigations prove that the deposition he was about to give was true. His deposition I forwarded on the 22nd July to Mr. Malet, along with the following confidential letter:—

"Here is translate of a further statement by Ibcheram, in which he gives further particulars of his prpceedings in Bombay, which, if true, shows that some rascal has been pretending to influence with Reid, and making money on that pretence. The deponent pronounces the name

indistinctly Craik or Clerk? it may, however, have been a false name given to deceive the man; or if Reid had any European clerk, it may be him.

"I shall have the fellow up again to-morrow, to examine him more particularly regarding the place of Mr. Craik's residence, which is indistinctly pronounced in the deposition, and I do not know whether it means Mazagon or not. But the best chance of tracing the transaction will be in the books of Vrijlall Doolub, in which the bank notes for 10,000 rupees, said to have been given to Mr. Craik in October 1848, ought to be recorded." B.B., p. 1219.

On receipt of my communication another reference was made to the Advocate-General, who, of course, adhered to the opinion he had previously given. And, on the 1st of August, Mr. Malet, in acknowledging my letter of the 22nd July, with its enclosures, sent me M. Le Mesurier's notes. On the 16th of August, I forwarded the translation of an anonymous communication received from Bombay, professing to give a clue to the matters I was investigating. And in forwarding it to Mr. Malet, I observed as follows:—

"As Government was debarred by legal forms from adopting at the time, the steps which I took the liberty to suggest for obtaining the papers left in Bombay by Joteshwur Echaram, or for tracing the notes said to have been paid by him to Mr. Craig, I fear there is no hope now of satisfactorily proving the transaction, and I regret that I was not honoured by the communication, with your first letter, of the Advocate General's opinion forwarded with your second, as I should have done myself the honour to forward such information on oath as might yet perhaps have enabled you to effect the object. After the further delay, however, of 14 days, which had intervened between your first and second communication, there could be no hope of finding the papers, which will of course have been secured long ere this by Baba Nafra's agents, who it appears from the accompanying revelations are at work in Bombay to counteract the investigation on which I am engaged." B.B. p. 1221.

At the same time that the anonymous letter was sent to myself, another of the same nature was forwarded to Mr. Malet, who laid it before Council, but Lord Falkland "saw no use in taking further notice of this petition." When, however, three days after this minute was recorded, the anonymous petition sent to myself was

laid before Council, Messrs. Willoughby and Blane thought it of sufficient importance to be sent to the Deccan after Lord Falkland. His Lordship left it to the Chief Secretary "to make any enquiries, and take such steps as he may deem necessary." Mr. Blane recommended that Ragoba, a clerk in the office of the Paymaster General, whose name was mentioned in both anonymous letters as mixed up with the transaction, should be interrogated. But to this Mr. Malet objected, on the ground that "as it is "not improbable that trustworthy information may be had from "Baroda on which enquiries may at a future time be based, any "investigation on information received anonymously might, by "forewarning the parties, defeat future enquiry, while the nature "of the information at present available precludes any satisfactory "investigation at present."

Kept in ignorance of the proceedings and views of Government, and my past experience having taught me to expect no aid or countenance to my enquiries, I put myself in communication with Captain Barr, the Paymaster General, and asked him to interrogate his clerk, Ragoba. He did so. A very exaggerated idea of the extent of my discoveries at Baroda had got abroad. I was supposed to have got to the bottom of the prolonged system of corruption which linked together Bombay and the Guicowar capital. And Ragoba, who was impressed with this erroneous view, was in great terror when called on by Captain Barr to explain his share in the business. His statement was distinct, and confirmatory of that of Joteshwur; though there was reason to believe that neither the one nor the other told the entire truth. And Captain Barr, acting on the information thus obtained, proved that a sum of £1000 (in notes) *had* been taken by Joteshwur at the time specified. The numbers of the notes had not been noted; so they could not be traced.

The enquiry at this stage was embarrassed by the fact of the papers referring to this matter having been placed in the hands of Mr. Smith—*Craig's brother-in-law.* And soon after, on learning this, Captain Barr gave up the enquiry as fruitless. On the 7th of January 1852, the "Secretaries" were formed into a Com-

mittee to report on the conduct of those subordinates in the Government offices whom Ragoba's statement seemed to implicate in these transactions. The result of their deliberations, so far as concerned the money destined for Mr. Reid, was, that *probably* Joteshwur, Craig, Ragoba, and another individual, divided the money between themselves.

The logical force of their arguments, or the legitimacy of some of their assumptions, is not quite obvious; but that is unimportant. They admit that the money was obtained from Nafra's agents, and that Nafra was led to believe that it reached Mr. Reid. And this was all that I myself had ever stated, or attempted to prove.*

The reader who has done me the honour to peruse the foregoing observations, will I think admit, that in prosecuting my enquiries, I evinced no want of faith in Mr. Reid's integrity, and was guilty of no unfriendly spirit towards him. What then does he think of the following attacks on me from the pen of that gentleman, who thus writes at page 62.

" Col. Outram's account (Khutput Report, Part II. Sec. VI.) of the conduct, before Mr. Frere's commission, of the only witness who declared that he had seen me, viz. Joteshwur Eecharam, is characteristic. 'It was Joteswhur, the man who had been sent by Baba 'Nafra to bribe Mr. Reid, and in the following year had been the confi-'dential bearer of a letter to Mr. Willoughby. He perjured himself 'deliberately, &c.' The evidence of this man, taken before Col. Outram, is a specimen of the mode of conducting such business at Baroda. There is no cross-examination in order to ascertain whether he could ever have seen me at all (which of course he never did). He might have been questioned as to the date on which he saw me; the place; my appearance; the language of conversation; and a hundred other particulars, which might at once—and probably, if asked at the time, would at once,—have proved either that his whole story was a fabrication, or that he had been deceived. Col. Outram must have been satisfied of the untruth of this man's story in this particular, or

---

* The Committee's Report is given at p.p. 1260, 1269. At page 1263, the Committee remark on the " irregularity " of my having sought from Captain Barr that assistance which it seemed to me vain to look for at the hands of Government. And yet with some inconsistency they admit that Captain Barr was aiding me with the cognizance and sanction of Government.

he would have followed up his enquiries on the points I have noticed. If Furké or his friends drew up the examination, all that was wanted possibly was the mention of my name. That obtained, nothing beyond was sought for. Further questions would have broken down the witness' credibility." PP. 62, 63.

It were well if Mr. Reid would inform us what he finds exceptionable in this remark made by me in my Khutput Report, when adverting to the difficulties which surrounded the prosecution. Joteshwur *had* been sent to Bombay "*with a view to corrupting certain parties there.*" (B.B. p. 1051.) And though Mr. Frere did not consider it legally established, that he was deputed "*with the specific object of bribing Mr. Reid,*" he DID find it proved that "*he had spent large sums of money, ostensibly for purposes of corruption.*" And the Secretaries—all of them personal friends of Mr. Reid—admit that this money was accounted for to Nafra, as having been given to that gentleman.

How far Mr. Reid, knowing all this so thoroughly well as he does know it, could have found in his heart or his conscience to pen the remainder of the paragraph, is to myself utterly incomprehensible. If I did not cross-question Joteshwur about Mr. Reid's appearance, &c., it was simply because the man did not even pretend to have spoken to him on the subject of his mission. And if I *had* cross-questioned him, they who know what hard things Mr. Reid's friends in the Government were "minuting" in regard to me, simply because I sought to vindicate their late colleague's character, may readily guess what would have been said and written if I had put the interrogatories spoken of by Mr. Reid. And what would Mr. Reid have written? Judging from the style of his present Pamphlet, I am justified in assuming that he would have accused me of having tried to bolster up a case against him, by pointing out the accuracy with which the witness described the appearance of a well-known man who was to be seen daily in public—the locality of the house in which all Bombay knew that he resided—and "a hundred other particulars" which the witness might have ascertained without going near him. My examinations of the man may have been imperfect, but they were carried on in no hostile feeling towards Mr. Reid, as my correspondence proves.

Mr. Reid thus concludes his allusions to the mission of Joteshwur.

"It is more than probable that the mission to Bombay in 1848 had entirely in view to keep up that disgraceful connection with the political department of the Bombay secretariat, which we know has so long existed; (and I have little doubt, does so at the present moment; —nay I would go farther, and express my belief that the same facility of obtaining information, where large sums are expended for the purpose, exists in all offices throughout India), and that the mention of my name in this matter was an afterthought, arising solely out of the hostile machinations of Furké's party; the knowledge which they had obtained that I, in the first instance, had opposed the displacement of Nursoo Punt, in order to make room for Furké at the residency; and the appearance of the 'Maurrice' letter,—whether this was one of their own artifices, or whether, in reality, the communication of a friend to Nursoo Punt.* No faith can be put in the after-statement of Moonims and Gomashtas, as to what were their objects at a former period. I believe that Furké, wielding the influence of the Resident, could have procured any such evidence that might have been desired." PP. 63, 64.

Comment on such assertions is superfluous, after what I have shown not only to be the facts of the case, but to have been known to Mr. Reid as such. In the next Chapter it will be my duty to prove that the insinuations indulged in, here and elsewhere, by Mr. Reid, as to the influence of the Fudkey, are made in the teeth of official records, contained in those Blue Books to which Mr.

* Mr. Reid well knows that there was never anything in the most remote degree approaching to an attempt to displace Nursoo, in order to make room for the Fudkey. He knows as well as any one that Nursoo *volunteered* his resignation about the time he saw his corrupt practices were being detected. He knows that he himself had minuted that Nursoo's intention to resign on the completion of his thirty years' service had been previously intimated to Government. He knows that the invitation given to that man to recall his resignation was an unparallelled act on the part of Government. He knows that in the estimation of those who have officially investigated the matter, those "cogent arguments" by which he secured this temporary triumph to a criminal, were unjust and fallacious. And knowing all this, he must indeed have laboured under mental confusion when he penned the passage above quoted. The more so as he had himself been a party to, if not the very author of, the Minute of the 7th of October, in which it was distinctly stated that Nursoo Punt's resignation was not occasioned by any conduct of mine. —*Vide antea*, p. 34.

Reid so frequently appeals, but from which, when he does quote, he quotes, as we have seen, in a very peculiar manner.

I have now only to observe, on certain remarks made by Mr. Reid in reference to the Joteshwur mission, at page 62 of his Pamphlet. He is alluding to the charge of corruption, not equivocally preferred against him by "Indus."

"The base insinuation respecting money sent from Baroda requires but little comment. *A proper distinction is drawn, throughout the Blue Book*, which your correspondent cannot or will not discover (as I have on a former occasion observed,) *between an attempt to bribe, and the obtaining money under the false pretence of bribing;* both equally criminal in the parties prepared to bribe; but differing in respect to the other party inasmuch as, in the one case, he must be cognizant of an attempt, while in the other he may ever remain in ignorance of even the design. *If such design ever existed in reference to myself, it is no more than existed in reference to Mr. Willoughby, Mr. Malet, Col. Outram himself, and others.* Our characters will, I trust, defend us from any imputation of criminality because natives are corrupt; and we must be content with lamenting that our purity could not protect us from the belief, even among the dupes of the corruptionists at Baroda, that any English gentlemen, holding the high positions that we did, could be corrupted." PP. 61, 62.

Since "*throughout the Blue Books*" I have "drawn the proper distinction," referred to by Mr. Reid; and since from beginning to end I expressed my firm belief in his integrity, wherefore may I ask, has that gentleman seen fit to charge me with having had recourse to "*tortuosity*," and other discreditable proceedings, with a view to prove him guilty of improper practices. And I protest against being placed in the same category with Mr. Reid. For though it is true that designs existed to offer bribes to Mr. Willoughby, Mr. Malet, and myself, as well as to Mr. Reid, there is a marked want of parallellism in our cases. When Mr. Malet discovered that his name had been placed in the bribe list—*he called for enquiry.* When Mr. Willoughby was informed by me (in 1837), that certain unjust decisions were attributed to his corrupt influence, and that there were plausible arguments in support of the supposition, *he hastened to thank me for my friendly letter;—he lost no time in showing it to the Governor;—and he begged to be excused from henceforth taking any part in the trans-*

action of Baroda business. When I myself discovered that it had been in contemplation to offer me a bribe of £5,000 on my return from Egypt—*I forthwith despatched the document which proved the fact to Government, and urged enquiry with what was deemed unofficial earnestness.* When Mr. Reid was informed that the Blue Books contained matters requiring explanation at his hands, he treated them with superb indifference, until a public writer, taking a different view of his character from myself, plainly taxed him with personal corruption. And then, instead of expressing satisfaction at my having sought to vindicate his character, he falls foul of me for having reported that it required vindication; he attributes to me the vilest motives; he assails my mental and moral endowments; he perverts my meaning; and, carried away by the fervor of self-exculpation, he misstates my arguments. He flies in the face of facts, and of the opinions of those who, having officially investigated the subject, were best qualified to pronounce a judgment on it; and he unblushingly stands up as the champion of the convicted criminal through whom his name came to be "associated with the foulest of deeds and the vilest of men."

It is not because "natives are corrupt" that the inhabitants of Baroda imputed corruption to him, but because there was what Mr. Frere calls "*an unhappy concatenation of circumstances,*" which to them appeared, *primâ facie,* inexplicable on any hypothesis save the one which led to the supposition that Mr. Reid was corrupt himself, and the supporter of corruption. And the views of the Baroda people on this subject will not be improved when Mr. Reid's Pamphlet comes to be translated (and doubtless, ere this, Nursoo Punt has taken care to have it translated) into the native languages. That Pamphlet, in its translated form, will do more to convince the natives of Baroda of the "*efficacy of Khutput,*" than fifty years will suffice to undo.

Mr. Reid, moreover, greatly errs in supposing that the public of India—European and native—will conceive that there was nothing left to him but to lament the existence of a belief in his own corruption. What it was in his power to do, he has failed to do. And this fact will sink deeply into many minds.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FUDKEY.

Amidst the many extraordinary mistakes committed by Mr. Reid throughout his Pamphlet, not the least remarkable are the assumptions in which he indulges regarding that especial object of his dislike—the Fudkey. Through this man's honest efforts I was, in 1848, enabled to expose those frauds which Nursoo Punt so criminally endeavoured to conceal. And it need therefore occasion no surprise, that the gentleman whose "cogent arguments" procured the temporary triumph of the since convicted Nursoo, should entertain unfriendly feelings to all who had been concerned in exposing his misdeeds. But it is a legitimate subject of astonishment that, led away by these unfriendly feelings, and by the animosity felt towards myself, Mr. Reid should have indulged in allegations and insinuations regarding him, which the Blue Books, on which he professes to base his allegations, proved to be diametrically the reverse of correct.

Mr. Reid represents me as having, in 1848, intentionally withheld information regarding this man, which it was my duty to have afforded; and, not satisfied with this, he more than insinuates, that on my return from Egypt, in 1850, I became his dupe and tool; that I accepted his statements, followed his advice, carried out his wishes, and, in fact, allowed him to wield the power and influence of Resident. With what justice, a very brief statement will suffice to show.

Venaik Monsheree Fudkey, commonly called Baba Fudkey, is a gentleman of good Mahratta family—a relative of the officer

who had held the post of Commander-in-chief of the Paishwa's army. He is a native of the Deccan; but many years ago was deputed by his family to Baroda, to promote certain pecuniary claims against the firm of Hurree Bhugtee of which the Guicowar was a partner. In 1837-38, he aided Mr. Malet and myself, in our investigations into the systematic bribery and corruption which pervaded the native political establishments of Guzerat. In recognition of these services, he was appointed Native Agent for the Rewa Kanta; and he acquitted himself of his duties in a manner to elicit a warm tribute of praise from Mr. Malet. In 1839, Mr. Malet was succeeded by Mr. Remington, who avows having been early prejudiced against the Fudkey on account of is independent bearing; and in 1843 that gentleman got rid of him. No charge was brought against him, though he had held the office for five and a half years under the hostile espoinage of the relatives of those corrupt servants whose rogueries he had brought to light. Mr. Remington broke up the Fudkey's appointment into four clerkships, and one of them, with proportionally reduced allowances, was placed at his disposal. Having failed to record a prompt acceptance of the offer, he found himself out of place altogether. He petitioned Government for re-employment; and his petition was sent "*for Report*" to the officiating Resident at Baroda, to whom (*at that time*) the Political Agent for the Rewa Kanta was subordinate. The officiating Resident, as ill luck would have it, was Mr. Remington, who made a reply, the injustice of which I have demonstrated at some length in my Khutput Report (B.B. p. 1382 to p. 1388); and in another Report, dated 22nd June, 1850, which does not appear in the Blue Books,* he accused the Fudkey of having lived beyond his means, insinuating that the alleged extra expenditure must have been improperly met; and he described him as possessing too much influence over the subordinates of the office.

* But which, by some mysterious process, found its way to a Bombay newspaper, and has been published by "Indus" in the 4th edition of his "*Bombay Briberies.*"

There was no one in Council to pen "cogent arguments" in behalf of the bold and faithful servant whose services in the cause of purity had raised up so many enemies. And in May 1844, the Government declared, on the strength of Mr. Remington's unsubstantiated and unquestioned Report, that he seemed a very "unfit person to be employed in any political capacity."

Having left Guzerat in 1838, I was ignorant of these incidents in the Fudkey's history, when, after an absence of nearly ten years, I was nominated to the post of British Resident at Baroda.

Soon after my assumption of office I made enquiries regarding the Fudkey. I learned from Nursoo Punt that he had been dismissed for misconduct; and the Government reply to Mr. Remington was brought to my notice. I was grieved but not surprised at the intelligence; for I had a painful recollection of the fate of other native servants, who, nothwithstanding their former high character, and the services they had rendered in the exposure of corruption, had, soon after their promotion, fallen into snares laid for them by the Nagurs, and themselves been guilty of malversation. And when I took into consideration the contaminated atmosphere of the Baroda court which Fudkey had for years been breathing, his fall seemed to me so little a matter of surprise, that I peremptorily refused all his applications to be permitted to pay his respects to me.

In the summer of 1848, however, the collusion of Nursoo with the perpetrators of the frauds which I was investigating (in the cases of Govind Row and Gorajie Pol) rendered it necessary to seek extraneous aid. But I in vain sought it among my own subordinates. And, in my difficulty I bethought myself of the Fudkey, of whose sagacity, zeal, and application, I retained a grateful recollection; and who, I remembered, had been of signal service in unravelling frauds to the prejudice of that very Gorajie Pol, on whose case I was then engaged, of a similar nature to the frauds which formed the subject of my enquiries. "I was thus"—to quote from my Khutput Report—"induced to investigate the grounds on which Government had founded its decision against the Fudkey; and a careful study of the case satisfied me that Government had

been misled into an act of great injustice towards this individual Impressed with this conviction, I should have appealed, on his behalf, for a reconsideration of his case, *had I not discovered that the prohibition against his employment had been virtually annulled by the permission granted to him on the 5th of July* 1847—*to apply to the local authorities on the occurrence of a vacancy*—a permission, which appeared to me a tacit acknowledgment on the part of Government that its former condemnation had been unmerited.

"I accordingly solicited him to aid me in investigating the case of Gorajie Pol. At first he objected to do so, on the ground that, by exposing the rascality of Nursoo Punt, he would assuredly bring on himself a series of persecutions so soon as I left Baroda. And in justification of his fears, he reminded me of what he had already suffered in consequence of his exposure of the Nagur intrigues (in 1837, 38.) I laughed at his fears. I assured him that no such persecutions as he dreaded would be tolerated at the present day; and I succeeded in securing his services, much to the alarm and indignation of Nursoo Punt."

The zeal and ability displayed by the Fudkey in the difficult task I had assigned him, entitled him to my gratitude. I believed that they would be duly appreciated by Government, and I recommended him as Nursoo's successor. But, as has been seen, the "cogent arguments" of Mr. Reid led to the continuance of Nursoo Punt in the post which he had betrayed. A prohibition was issued against the Fudkey being employed at the Residency. I myself was, in my absence, censured for having made use of his services—a procedure which the Government were pleased to declare proved that "I could not have examined the records of my office."

When, on my return to Baroda, I discovered that the Fudkey's fears had been realized, that he had in very deed been subjected to shameful persecutions, instigated by Nursoo Punt, I deemed it my duty to make an appeal on his behalf. And I deemed it no less my duty to vindicate myself from the blame imputed to me for having employed the Fudkey in 1848. I showed that the

ignorance of the records, applied not to myself, but to those who had censured me. I explained the circumstances under which I had employed the Fudkey. And I drew attention to their own letter of July 1847, authorizing him to apply to the local authorities on the occurrence of a vacancy.

My explanation and reasons were admitted by Lord Falkland to be "SATISFACTORY." (B.B. p. 985.)

Yet Mr. Reid, with all these facts before him, has not hesitated to write as follows:—

"Of Furké (as I have said above,) I knew nothing beyond what Col. Outram had mentioned, namely, that he had formerly been native agent in the Rewa Kanta, but was 'not now in Government employ.' Why he was not then in employ, it did not occur to me to enquire. Col. Outram had an opportunity of informing Government of every particular respecting his protegé when he recommended him in his letter of the 9th September 1848, to succeed Nursoo Punt as native agent; and on such an occasion, he was bound to state all he knew, good or ill, respecting him, so as to guide Government in its decision. In par. 42 *et seq.* of his Khutput Report, Part II. Sec. II., he tells us 1389.
that when he joined at Baroda in May 1847, he was fully aware of Furké's having been 'dismissed from Government employ on account of his misconduct;' and of the Government having in the letter of the 20th March 1844, declared him unfit for political employ; and that it was only when he desired his assistance in 'a very intricate and long- 1390.
'pending case,' that he discovered 'that the prohibition against his re-
'employment had been virtually annulled by the permission granted to
'him on the 5th July 1847 to apply to the local authorities on the
'occurrence of a vacancy.' Whether this letter of the 5th July 1847 1390.
to Furké will bear the construction which Col. Outram places upon it,—whether it was only the ordinary answer given by Government to every application for employment,—or whether it was given after a full consideration of the facts which had led to the declaration of Furké's ineligibility, and with a design of removing it,—and whether a corresponding communication was made to the 'local authorities,' (of whom the Baroda Resident would have been one) cannot (that I have discovered) be seen from what Col. Outram has told us in the Blue Book. It is clear, however, that Col. Outram knew regarding Furké everything that could be known, and that he did not communicate his knowledge to the Government on an occasion when it was most essentially his duty to do so. I will ask, what would Col. Outram have said if

Nursoo Punt, in recommending any man to him for official employment, had omitted to state facts which he knew—injuriously, though in his opinion unjustly—affecting his character?" PP. 35, 36.

After what has already been said, the reader requires not to be told that this statement is singularly incorrect. Passing over Mr. Reid's profession of ignorance of everything regarding a political servant, whose case had twice come before the Government of which he was a member, I have to remark, that when he says that in my Khutput Report I avowed myself to have been "fully aware "of the Fudkey having been dismissed from Government employ "on account of misconduct," he states what is simply inconsistent with the fact. I never so expressed myself. What I stated was, that "*I was informed, &c.*" Nursoo Punt was my informant. And, as the very Report from which Mr. Reid professes to quote shows, it was only when I examined the correspondence that I discovered *that the Fudkey had* NOT *been dismissed for misconduct; that he had never been dismissed at all; that he had been got rid of by a side wind; and that the letter in which the Government declared that he "was a very unfit person to be employed in any political capacity," was based on a report which a little reflection showed me to be unjust, and the injustice of which, I may add, has since been admitted by the Bombay Government itself.* (*Vide* Lord Falkland's Minute, dated 5th June 1852.)*

Again, Mr. Reid is either singularly ignorant of matters with which he ought to be acquainted, or else he knows full well that the letter written to the Fudkey in July 1847, under orders of the Government of which he was a member, was NOT "the ordinary answer given by Government to every application for employment."

That letter was in reply to a petition, in which, after detailing the hard usage he had received, and urging, with truth, that not one single charge of infidelity or malversation had been brought against him, he begged that he might be readmitted to the Government service. And thus ran the document alluded to:—

"In reply to your petition, dated the 1st instant, soliciting that you

* Ordered to be printed.

may be appointed to some situation under Government, I am directed to inform you that the Honourable the Governor in Council sees no reason to interfere in your behalf, *but that you may, on a vacancy occurring, apply to the local authorities.*"

Let it be borne in mind that the Secretary (Mr. Malet) through whom I forwarded my recommendation that the Fudkey should be Nursoo's successor, knew more of his history than I myself did; that he was in charge of the department in which were all the records relating to the Fudkey; that it was he who had written the letter of July 1847, intimating to the Fudkey that he had the permission of Government to apply to the Resident for employment on the occurrence of a vacancy; and I think it will be admitted that if I erred in aught, I erred merely in not giving that exposition of the injustice of Mr. Remington's Report, which even the Bombay Government now admit to possess a considerable amount of cogency.*

My letter, recommending the Fudkey for the post of Native Agent was dated the 9th September 1848. On the 12th of that month I went to Bombay; and I did not resume my appointment

---

* The implied censure, even were it as just as it is devoid of foundation, would come with singularly bad grace from the gentleman who thrust back into the office which he had betrayed, a man whose relationship with notorious corruptionists had been alluded to by hinself in a manner to indicate that had it been known in time it would have been a bar to his appointment. And, in reference to this subject, I would recall the reader's attention to what has been said at pages 33, 39, and 56. Mr. Reid possibly may not have been the author or inspirer of the Minute of the 7th of October 1848, in which Lord Falkland was made to express sentiments which he now disavows, and to acquit by anticipation a man of whose guilt he some weeks after had no doubt. But even should Mr. Reid not have been—and few will doubt that he was—the inspirer or author of that Minute, he knew full well when he endorsed it, that his Lordship could not at that time have been in a position to form an opinion on the subject. He knew that the Minute did prejudge an undecided case. And what shall we say or think of the functionary who was a party to such a transaction —a transaction so calculated to confirm the belief of the natives in his corrupt interest in the fortunes of Nursoo Punt ?

till May 1850. From that period till my removal from office in December 1851, Mr. Reid represents me as having been in close communication with the Fudkey—his tool and creature. I now proceed to show how diametrically these representations are the reverse of fact—simply premising that were it otherwise, Mr. Reid's case would not be one whit improved. For the question is, not how or whence I obtained that information which enabled me eventually to bring to justice the convicted criminal with whose character Mr. Reid is so mysteriously impelled to identify his own reputation, but, whether the man is or is not a rascal. But to my task.

When, on the resumption of my duties at Baroda in 1850, I found that what I regarded as great injustice, had been done, both to the Fudkey and myself, I made efforts to secure a reconsideration of his case; and I wrote the Report of June 1850. But my efforts were vain. Though Lord Falkland minuted that the explanations I had given for employing the Fudkey were "satisfactory," no communication to that effect was made to myself. Instead of reinvestigating the case of that valuable public servant, the Government (as the Court of Directors have reminded them) rebuked me for reopening the case.* (BB. p. 235.) And though I continued to make every effort in my power to procure justice for the Fudkey, I felt it to be my duty to abstain from bestowing any mark of regard or favor on one who still lay under the ban of Government. My feelings on this point became still more potent, when, in the course of time, charges (which eventually proved to be the result of foul conspiracy) were brought against him. *Not only did I not admit him to terms of intimacy, or seek his counsel, as Mr. Reid has seen fit to assert, but* I PROHIBITED HIS COMING TO THE RESIDENCY. And with the exceptions about to be specified, that prohibition was so rigorously enforced, as to be productive of serious embarrassment to myself, by enabling Nursoo Punt's creatures and allies to deter those who

* Notwithstanding Mr. Willoughby's protest, that, as a man of honor, I had been bound to re-open the case.

had it in their power to aid me, from giving me any assistance, by pointing to what was regarded as my ungrateful treatment of a man who had been ruined for the honest service he had rendered myself and others.

On one occasion, in March 1851, I agreed at the request of my guest, Mr. Grant, who took a deep interest in the Fudkey, to admit him to *a mere ceremonial visit.* Subsequent to this, during his trial before Major Fulljams on those charges, got up by Nursoo Punt's son, which were proved to have been the result of a vile conspiracy, the Fudkey petitioned for leave to examine the records of my office for information requisite to his defence; and I granted him the desired permission, but directed my native agent to inform him that I could hold no personal intercourse with him, and that all his requisitions must be preferred to my assistant, Lieutenant Battye. Again, on the 31st of August 1851, in compliance with an urgent entreaty to be allowed to speak to me on pressing matters of great importance to himself, I gave him a (*standing*) interview. Somewhere about the same period, his evidence was required on the trial of Nursoo Punt, then proceeding before Mr. Commissioner Frere; and as the trial took place in the Residency, he of course came thither. During the progress of the trial, the officer who assisted in the conduct of the prosecution, desiring insight into the intricate case of Gorajié Pol, which the Fudkey had unravelled with so much ability in 1848, sent for him, and submitted some accounts to him. But the moment I discovered that this had been done, I sent to demand the papers back, and censured the officer in question.* Again, in November 1851, after the Fudkey had been honorably acquitted by Major Fulljames of the charges brought against him through the agency of Nursoo's son, *and a few days before my own removal from office,* I did send for him to aid me in a difficult matter—there being no other native at Baroda in whose sagacity and honesty I could rely.

* My able friend Lieutenant Pelly, of the 17th Regiment of Bombay Native Infantry.

Such was the nature of my intimacy with the Fudkey—such the amount of the assistance and advice received by me from the man whom Mr. Reid has chosen to represent as possessing my ear, influencing my judgment, and exercising my authority during the years 1850, 1851. And the reader may judge of the confused condition of mind under which Mr. Reid brought himself to give so distorted a view of the facts of the case, when I submit certain passages contained in those of my Blue Books on which he professed to base his monstrous allegations.

On the 7th of December 1851, I thus expressed myself, in reference to certain allegations respecting the Fudkey, contained in the letter in which my removal from office was intimated to me—

"In your 124 para. Baba Fudkey is designated as my 'approved assistant in detecting the frauds and intrigues going on at Baroda.'

"As matters of vital interest to Baba Fudkey are now before Government, it is fair towards him, and for the ends of justice, that his character should not be undermined by misrepresentations; and his Lordship in Council must have been lamentably misinformed when you were directed, in allusion to a given case, to name as my 'approved assistant' an individual who not only rendered me no assistance therein, but who was, I believe, during the larger portion, if not the whole of the time the said case was being investigated, absent from this capital and residing in Bombay.

"I beg further to add, that until when, a few days ago, compelled 'by sheer necessity,' as stated and explained in my letter, No. 221, B., dated 2nd instant, to seek Baba Fudkey's aid in deciphering certain Soucarry writings, I have never, in any case, called in his assistance since I returned from Egypt. And moreover, having discovered that when a gentleman who assisted me in the late commission did, in the case of Ghorajee Poll, without my knowledge, send for Baba Fudkey, and entrusted certain village accounts to him for the purpose of ascertaining whether they had been correctly represented, I sent, the moment I heard of the circumstance, to recall the papers; recovered them before they had been four hours in his possession; and permitted him to enter no further into the business than was necessary to enable him to render a clear statement of the said village accounts, the correctness of the details of which, as given by him in 1848, had been questioned before the Commissioner." B.B. p. 915.

Having previously, on the 2nd of December, in another commu-

nication in reference to my proceedings at the same period, thus reported—

"As explanation for having employed the Baba on this occasion, I beg to repeat, that sheer necessity compelled me, and that I had the less scruple in having recourse to his assistance, because he had so lately been acquitted by Captain Fulgams of the charges brought against him; and because he could have no motive for deceiving me as to the real interpretation of writings, the originals of which he knew would ultimately be submitted both to the Bombay and Guicowar Governments." B.B. p. 1169.

And in a previous paragraph of the same letter, in reference to certain untrue allegations on the part of the Guicowar's Minister, I stated (p. 1168) "*my avowed disapprobation of Baba Fudkey's being employed in any capacity whatever under the Durbar, alone prevented His Highness calling him to his Ministry.*"

Nor were these the only declarations as to my connection with the Fudkey, contained in the Blue Books. Thus if Mr. Reid had turned to page 147, he would have found that on the 31st August, 1850, in writing to Mr. Andrews, I observed—

"As to Baba Fudkey, or any one else, having advised me on this occasion, you are quite mistaken. * * * So far from Baba Fudkey having had anything to do with the business, *he has not once been admitted to the Residency, or to a personal interview with me, since my return from Egypt.*

There are, I believe, other passages in the Blue Books which are perfectly inconsistent with the statements and insinuations so often indulged in by Mr. Reid in reference to the Fudkey; but these will suffice to illustrate that gentleman's accuracy, and the value due to his assertions.

I beg to be understood as not charging Mr. Reid with wilfully stating that which he knew to be untrue. My charge is, that he reproduced the erroneous statements put forth by Mr. Andrews and Nursoo Punt, and accepted by the Bombay Government, without taking the trouble to examine whether they were not diametrically opposed to the real facts of the case.*

* It may not be amiss here to notice, that in a petition to the Court

of Directors, written in May, 1852, the Fudkey takes credit for having assisted me in my investigations of the Joitæbhae case. It may be a misapprehension on the part of the gentleman who wrote out the Fudkey's English petition, who, as ignorant of Mahratta as the Fudkey is of English, must have been dependent on the intervention of the Fudkey's carkoons and other interpreters; or it may be that that gentleman assumed, as a matter of course, that the Joitæbhae case, which excited so much attention at the time in Bombay, was among the corruption cases in which the Baba aided me; or it may be the result of the tendency to exaggeration so inherent in the native character. But whatever its source, it is a mistake.

CHAPTER IX.

JOITABHAE SETTANEE.

At page 319 of the Baroda Blue Book will be found my report on the case of Joitabhae Settanee, the widow of a Baroda banker, who was for a long period subjected to a series of the most heartless persecutions. These were inflicted on her by Baba Nafra, the trustee of her deceased husband, who enjoyed the active aid and support of the Baroda Durbar, and of his relative Nursoo Punt. Through favour of the former, the Guicowar's courts screened the criminal, and refused redress to his victim; while by the misrepresentations of the latter, the officer who officiated for me during my absence in Egypt, was betrayed into withholding from Joitabhae that reparation to which, in virtue of the "Guarantee," she was fully entitled.

Prior to my departure for Egypt, I had made arrangements which, by leaving the Guicowar's courts no excuse for longer delaying to promulgate some sort of a decision, would have enabled my successor to reinvestigate the case on appeal, and thus have put it in his power to bring the conspirators to justice. I had not at that time any conception of the villanies that had been practised, but I was most anxious that a full investigation of the case should take place at the Residency, and that the Native Agent, Nursoo Punt, should not be allowed to take any part in the investigation. One of the first of those little incidents which induced me to doubt his honesty, was an attempt made by him to mislead me to the widow's prejudice. But Mr. Reid's "*cogent arguments*" in behalf of the corrupt Native Agent, by

which Lord Falkland was induced to invite Nursoo to remain in the post which he had betrayed, defeated my arrangements. No investigation took place; the persecutions of Joitabhae were continued; fresh indignities were heaped upon her; and these results I had no hesitation in attributing to the erroneous information conveyed to my *locum tenens* by Nursoo Punt. When, on the trial of the latter, the evidence of the former was taken, he exonerated his Native Agent; and took on himself the entire responsibility of his measures. But, as the Court of Directors have observed, "there is ample ground of moral conviction that Nursoo Punt misinformed Captain French, as he is clearly proved to have misinformed Colonel Outram." The acting Resident, they remark, was grossly misinformed of the facts of the case. In consequence of the erroneous information conveyed to him "he misled the "Government, and enabled the persecutors of Joitabhae to commit gross injustice;" and as "having only just arrived at Baroda, "he was in a great measure dependant for his information and "impressions on others, and particularly on his Native Agent" they hold that Captain French's testimony, though it necessitated the judicial acquittal of Nursoo, did in nowise alter the moral aspect of his case. And when it is remembered that the "strongest suspicions" were left on the minds of Mr. Frere, and the Court of Directors, that Nusoo had received a reward of £2800 for the services rendered by him to Baba Nafra in respect of this very case, the reader will, I think, admit that the Court's opinion is entitled to respectful assent. Whether the author of the "cogent arguments" by which a temporary triumph was secured to the corrupt Nursoo, is to any extent responsible for the "gross injustice" inflicted on Joitabhae after my departure for Egypt, is a question I should never have mooted had not Mr. Reid attempted, in more than one passage, to sneer away sympathy for the outraged Joitabhae, and to imply doubts of the reality of the outrages to which she was subjected.* These sneers and implications will not be lost on the people of Guzerat. And the confidence in the

* PP. 18, 28, and 65, of Mr. Reid's "Letter."

existing system will not be strengthened by learning that the man whom they have for a long time regarded as corrupt, and who they have been told will ere long obtain a seat in the Court of Directors, has found such tactics best suited to his self-exculpation. But, in order to show that the views promulgated by Nursoo's champion, are not concurred in by that honourable body into which he seeks admission, I subjoin an extract from one of their despatches:—

"The voluminous papers transmitted with this letter *fully prove that Joitabhae * * * has been the victim of a nefarious plot*, concocted by Baba Nafra * * * and of which the instruments were forgery, coercion of witnesses, subornation of perjury, and the forcible abduction of a child who had been, for 18 months, acknowledged to be the legitimate son of Joitabhae; and who, under pretence of being spurious, was delivered over by Baba Nafra to certain Coolies alleged to be his parents, soon after which he died. The widow was kept for nearly three years under a guard, without any provision from the firm for her support, and was disgraced and expelled from caste." B.B., pp. 8, 9.

These transactions, the Court of Directions elsewhere designate "*iniquitous*," and "*oppression of odious character;*" and there are few readers of the Blue Books who will not adopt the view taken by the Court of Directors, in preference to that *insinuated* by the apologist of Nursoo Punt in the following passage. The italics are those of Mr. Reid himself.

"Nursoo Punt *may be* the greatest villain that the corrupt soil of Baroda has ever generated; Baba Nafra *may be* in the same category; all their friends and supporters *may be* rightly placed in the same schedule; Jethabaee *may be* an injured angel; Furke, a persecuted saint:—But when I consider the nature of the plots in the series of dramas presented to us—the characters of the performers, from His Highness the Guikwar and Col. Outram down to the lowest kolee—and the locality of the scene of action—I am constrained to the conclusion that the justice of the catastrophes has not yet been shown, and that the whole of the matters treated under such circumstances remain still involved in a deep shade of darkness and of doubt." B.B. p. 65.

It is at all events consolitary to bear in mind, that the gentleman who, after perusing the Blue Books, feels constrained to such a conclusion, had not effected his entrance into the Court of Direc-

tors when the Baroda questions were discussed by that body. Not that any "cogent arguments" which he might have been inclined to urge in behalf of the criminal whose innocence he hints at, would have had any weight with his honourable colleagues; but because, the distrust and alarm which the tone and statements of his Pamphlet cannot fail to have excited in India, would have been materially enhanced had his views been promulgated under official sanction.

As it is, I have only to observe, that the natives of Baroda, like Mr. Reid, have some difficulty in discovering "the justice of the catastrophes." But their difficulty and his, differ in kind, and in degree. In Nursoo Punt they do *not* pretend to behold "the greatest villain that the corrupt soil of Baroda has ever generated:" but they *do* regard him as a corrupt and faithless public servant, whose villany secured a temporary triumph through the "cogent arguments" of the functionary with whom he boasted that he maintained an improper influence. They witnessed the official obstacles with which I had to contend, in my endeavours to bring him to punishment. They have pondered on the singular leniency towards the convicted culprit, displayed by Mr. Reid's friends, colleagues, and successors. And, in unhesitatingly declaring their belief that these gentlemen failed to vindicate the claims of justice when pronouncing sentence on Nursoo, they but express an opinion which has been deliberately recorded by the Court of Directors.

Their opinion of Baba Nafra, even if no stronger than that entertained by the Court of Directors, would justify them in considering the punishment awarded to that man as incommensurate with his crimes. For Joitabhae they never claimed angelic qualities, but they know that she has sustained grievous wrongs, including the abstraction and death of her child, and that the protraction of her sufferings is in a great measure referable to the efforts made by Mr. Reid in behalf of the unprincipled Nursoo. In the Fudkey's fate they behold a mournful warning to all natives who may feel tempted to act honestly, boldly, and energetically, in aid of such of their superiors as may be engaged in vindicating the purity of British administration. And I shall

be agreeably mistaken if they do not think that in Mr. Reid's Pamphlet they can discover further confirmation of the suspicions they have, it is to be assumed unjustly, so long entertained regarding him.

In one of Mr. Reid's remarks there is much truth. There is still much unfathomed doubt and darkness regarding the villanies of Nursoo and his protégés. For, there are those even in the Court of Directors—gentlemen of renown, whose good opinion Mr. Reid would fain cultivate—who consider that, in my attempts to resolve that doubt, and enlighten that darkness, I did not receive from the Government that support which was due to my investigations, "and which, a right view of the great importance "of vindicating the purity of our administration in the opinion "of the native community, ought to have led the Government to "extend to me."* And if, in spite of all the difficulties with which I had to contend, I have contrived to bring so much to light, and certain criminals to punishment, there are few who will believe that my achievements would not have been greater, and the results more satisfactory, had I not—in the language of Colonel Sykes—"found my efforts for a great public object, through a course of years, constantly thwarted, and inadequately supported."†

---

* Protest of Mr. Mangles, Captain Eastwick, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Plowden.

† Protest of Colonel Sykes. Both these protests are given by Mr. Chapman, in his Pamphlet entitled, "Baroda and Bombay, their Political Morality."

CHAPTER X.

THE NAGUR TRIALS.

The only erroneous statements on the part of Mr. Reid which still remain to be noticed, are those made by him in reference to what are called the Nagur trials.

The history of events, so designated, is detailed at some length in the Baroda Blue Books (pp. 1342-1380) with a view to show that the corruptibility of the Bombay Government had long been an article of the popular belief in Guzerat; that such belief had oft-times deen brought to the notice of the Government; and that its origin, progress, and permanency, were clearly attributable to the remarkable tenderness displayed by them towards corrupt native servants; and to the singular unwillingness they displayed to assist their local officers, in uprooting the systematic corruption amongst their subordinates in which they themselves were supposed to participate. The predecessors in office of Nursoo Punt, towards whom such singular leniency was manifested, belonged to the Nagur (or snake) division of Brahmins—a class of men famed even amongst their castemen for their subtlety, avarice, and unscrupulousness. From this class, the various appointments in the native departments of the political establishments in Guzerat were almost exclusively supplied. For a long period they rioted in almost unchecked authority; and to their influence and proceedings was mainly due the fact, that for many years antecedent to 1836, extensive tracts of Guzerat became the theatre of

violence, anarchy, and outrage.* Representing themselves as able to secure such decisions as they chose, through their corrupt alliance with men in power, they encouraged disaffection—promoted litigation—and instigated the chiefs to treat with contempt all appeal against the arrangements of the local officers. Every new suit was a source of gain to them—every fresh outbreak, with its consequent investigations, brought them additional clients—anxious to obtain, and ready to pay for, the exercise of their assumed power. For, a series of unfortunate coincidences had fully impressed the natives with the belief that this power was far from unreal, and that it was well worth the purchase money demanded by its possessors.

Till this systematic corruption should be broken up, and the natives be taught that the Bombay functionaries were above sharing with the Nagurs the profits of their nefarious compact, it was vain to hope that the peace of the disturbed district could be permanently secured. And in conjunction with other officers located in Guzerat, I addressed myself to the task of purging its political establishments. Our labours were eventually to a certain extent successful. But far from receiving from the Government that aid and encouragement which we naturally looked for at their hands, the most disheartening obstructions were thrown in our way; extraordinary facilities of escape were offered to the corrupt servants whom we wished to bring to justice; pleas more remarkable for their charity than their logical cogency, were offered in their behalf; and when, in spite of all difficulties, convictions were at length obtained, the Government treated the

---

* Extract from a despatch from the Honble. the Court of Directors, having reference to the period in question.

"Disorder had progressively increased, instead of diminishing, until at length, by the confession of all the local authorities, neither natives nor British officers could travel between Dussa and Abundabad without a strong escort. Our officers were subject to continual insult and ill-treatment, for which no reparation could be obtained: and the respect for the British name and character in that part of Guzerat was lower than at any former period."

convicted with a leniency which was universally regarded by the native community as evincing a corrupt and criminal sympathy with the offenders. They pleaded in behalf of this leniency, that the existing laws did not enable them to visit political servants with an adequate severity; but years passed, and thay made no efforts to obtain, by legislative enactments, those powers the absence of which they deplored. And they would not inflict the full extent of the penalties which were undoubtedly within their reach.

Much of the odium thus attached, in native estimation, to the Bombay Government at large, fell to the share of Mr. J. P. Willoughby, the Secretary in whose department the Nagur cases were considered. And I deemed it my duty to communicate to that gentleman the opinions entertained regarding him by the natives of Guzerat. Unlike Mr. Reid, Mr. Willoughby thanked me for my "*friendly communication;*" and he lost no time in applying to the Governor for permission to hold himself entirely aloof from the disposal of the cases. Of the Governor's concurrence in the suggested arrangements, I was not, however, apprized, till long after he had thanked me for the friendly communication I had sent him. And, in common with the other local officers, I continued for a long time to believe that to him we were still indebted for the obstacles thrown in our way. When I discovered my mistake, I hastened to set the Baroda resident of that date (1838) right, in respect of this matter; and my letter is given in the Blue Books in illustration of the correspondence which the Nagur trials elicited. Part of that correspondence bears the signature of Mr. Reid, who was then one of the Government Secretaries; and "Indus" having commented on what appeared Mr. Reid's share in the transactions, that gentleman has seen fit to write as follows:—

"The folly and unfairness of assuming that the Secretary signing a letter is, therefore, responsible for its contents, may be fully established from the papers under consideration. In these Nagur cases Col. Outram was guilty of that injustice towards his friend, Mr. Willoughby;—he discovered his error, and made an apology;—but he does not seem to have taken warning. The injustice has been repeated as respects myself; to expect an apology from your correspondent would be to give him credit for some sense of shame. I shall therefore pass on." P. 10.

These statements are simply inconsistent with fact. I was never guilty of "assuming that the Secretary signing a letter is therefore responsible for its contents." But I assumed, and was justified in assuming, that Mr. Willoughby was in a great measure responsible for the contents of the letters on the Nagur cases bearing his signature, because those cases belonged to his department, and because, as Mr. Reid tells us, at page 5,

In all cases the initiative is with the Governor. He either prepares his own minutes, having them when necessary copied in the office of his private secretary; *or they are brought to him in draft, for his consideration, by the secretary of the department*, either in his handwriting, or copied in his office from his rough drafts. *The latter is the usual process in all except cases of extraordinary importance*, or cases in which a Governor himself possesses that Indian or practical knowledge which enables him to propose measures without consultation with any other party.

Sir Robert Grant, who was Governor during the earlier history of the Nagur trials, was notoriously devoid of "that Indian or practical knowledge" to which Mr. Reid alludes; and, far from these trials being treated as of extraordinary importance, the whole correspondence, as given in the Blue Books, proves that they were disposed of in a manner to imply that they were of insignificant import. And no one acquainted with the character of Sir Robert Grant will believe the assertions of Mr. Reid, or any one else who may choose to affirm, that he was likely, in respect of these cases, to depart from the usage which prescribes that the Governor's minutes shall be drafted for him by a Secretary. Still less will they believe that he would, save under the "cogent argument" of some Secretary, have penned the letters which appear in the Blue Books.

Sir Robert Grant died in June 1838, and was succeeded by Mr. Farish, with whom, according to Mr. Reid, the initiative lay in the disposal of all cases that came under the discussion of his Government. Than Mr. Farish no one was better qualified, in virtue of "Indian or practical knowledge," to dispense with the services of a Secretary in the preparation of his minutes; and if he had been led to regard the Nagur cases as of "extraordinary importance," he doubtless would have taken their consideration

into his own hands:—but that he did not do so is affirmed by Mr. Reid, who attributes to Sir G. Anderson the credit of having disposed of them after Sir Robert Grant's death. Sir George Anderson certainly was one member of Mr. Farish's council: but whether he will feel inclined to accept the compliment paid to him by Mr. Reid, is a matter yet to be determined. This, however, is a question with which I have no concern. Suffice it to say, that, though I quoted Mr. Reid's letters, as I quoted those of Mr. Willoughby and others, I never, in any of my reports, attributed to Mr. Reid responsibility for the letters which bore his signature. But I may add, that, had I assumed him to be the Secretary to whom the Nagur cases were confided after Mr. Willoughby had been permitted to sever himself from them, I should have been justified in the assumption. It would have been contrary to all precedent, if these cases had not been handed over to the management of some Secretary. The impression left on my mind, by my communications with the men in the office in 1838, distinctly was, that to Mr. Reid was assigned the duties of which Mr. Willoughby was relieved. It is a fact, admitted by Mr. Reid himself, that when, in 1841, Mr. Willoughby objected on conscientious grounds, to accompany Sir J. Carnac to Baroda, Mr. Reid was selected to perform that duty. And that Mr. Reid was considered by the natives of Baroda, to have some share in conducting the business of Mr. Willoughby's department, is evidenced by the fact, of there having been assigned to him £6,000 of the money intended to be administered by Dhakjie Dadajie, the Guicowar's Bombay agent.

Mr. Reid emphatically denies that he ever had any connection, direct or indirect, with the disposal of the Nagur cases, beyond signing the letters issued after Mr. Willoughby had severed his connection with the questions of which they treated, and seeing that they were in accordance with the minutes on which they were framed. Such a denial I am not inclined to cavil at. But it would have possessed more weight if Mr. Reid had not made a singular confession when treating of the subject. The Nagur cases formed a portion of the "political affairs of Guzerat;" and

these Mr. Reid tells us, at page 7, "throughout his whole career as Secretary and member of the Government, were conducted, under the Governors and their councils, by Mr. Willoughby"—while at page 10 he admits the fact of Mr. Willoughby having at one time "been specially permitted to hold himself aloof from the disposal of these cases." And the reader has already seen that during a considerable portion of the time that Mr. Reid was in council, Mr. Willoughby was his colleague; that on Mr. Malet, not on Mr. Willoughby, did it devolve to draft the Governor's minutes "on the political affairs of Guzerat;" and that, contrary to all rule and precedent, (as laid down by himself,) Mr. Reid took on himself Mr. Malet's duties, and wrote a minute which, but for recent agitation, would have, in all time coming, been attributed to Lord Falkland—a minute in which that nobleman was made to set forth "cogent arguments" in behalf of a corrupt public servant.

As the Officer through whom Nursoo Punt's rogueries were brought to light, and through whose investigations, as stated at length, resulted the necessity imposed upon Mr. Reid of publishing his Pamphlet, that gentleman bears me a grudge which displays itself in many injurious and unlooked for devices. Thus, in a note attached to page 8, he volunteers the following small piece of hypercriticism, from which our common friends can hardly fail to derive some amusement.

"Note. The real designation of this caste of Brahmuns is 'Nagu,' or 'Naga,' a Hindoo legend deriving their origin from the 'Nag' or cobra de capello. With the view, probably, of holding them up to public detestation, as endowed with all the evil attributes of that venemous reptile, Col. Outram terms them the 'Snake caste' and 'Snake fraternity.' But others describe them as an intelligent race, and celebrated among their countrymen for qualities the reverse of those thus assigned to them. Col. Outram may have been deceived by the mere sound of the name, or, as I understand he does not speak, read, or write either Goozuratee or Muratee (the languages alone in use in Goozurat), his interpreters, if unfriendly to the Nagus, may have misled him."

That the persistent admirer of Nursoo Punt, should look with favour on the Nagurs, is only consistent. But it is not quite con-

sistent in the author of this hypercritical note, who has no scruples about spelling other native names in a fashion very different from that adopted either by Indus, or in the Blue Books, to persist, as he does, in adopting my erroneous orthography. Consistency in such a matter, however, is of little importance to Mr. Reid, so long as he can say or insinuate aught which he thinks calculated to annoy me.

I readily acknowledge that I am no scholar, and no linguist; that my knowledge of Guzeratee is not very perfect; and that my acquaintance with Mahratta is not much more extensive. But it might have occurred to Mr. Reid that if I were so utterly ignorant as he pretends, I must be endowed with miraculous powers in some other respect. He well knows that, in 1836, I was selected to tranquilize a province of Guzerat, which for a long time had been the scene of anarchy and confusion,—and that I was successful. He is well aware that I had many delicate and difficult judicial investigations to conduct, and that the Government whose Secretary he was, bestowed many compliments on my "unremitting and laborious exertions," intimating that "the "eminently successful results of these labours; the temper, skill, "and patience of my investigations of claims and grievances, had "often been brought to the favourable notice of the Honourable "Court." He knows that I received most gratifying acknowledgments of the manner in which I investigated and remedied financial arrangements, which had been a source of much political disquietude. He is aware that I laboured, neither lightly nor in vain, in giving that permanence to the tranquilization I procured for the troubled districts, which could only be derived from an improved fiscal system, and the promotion of commerce. He knows that these objects were effected, not through—but in spite of—the efforts of my native subordinates, whose gains were in exact proportion to the disturbance that prevailed in the province. And knowing all this, he must assume that the results were obtained by the sheer force of dumb show—obtained, as he implies them to have been, by one utterly ignorant of the languages alone used in the country.

CONCLUSION.

If, in the foregoing pages, I have been compelled to record much to Mr. Reid's disadvantage, it will, I hope, be conceded, that I have neither exaggerated, nor set aught down in malice. And I believe that not even Mr. Reid himself will be able to detect a single passage in which I have had recourse to captious argument or unworthy verbal criticism. It is hardly to be expected that any one dealing with so complicated a mass of papers, as those contained in the Baroda Blue Books, shall altogether avoid mistakes, or a certain degree of inaccuracy. And it has been very far from my desire to take advantage of trifling or transparent inadvertencies. If, notwitstanding this disinclination, I have, in the fervour of controversy, been betrayed on any single occasion into the exercise of an unnecessary hypercriticism, I beg to apologise to the readers of these pages.

I would that with this contingent apology, I could couple such expressions of respect for Mr. Reid, as are to be found scattered, with no niggard hand, throughout my official Reports. But it were false and hypocritical to pretend that my estimate of that gentleman's character has not been materially modified by the further information, relative to his connection with Nursoo Punt, which I have derived from the Blue Books, and his own Pamphlet. And no one who honors me by perusing the foregoing pages will, I believe, hesitate to admit that, whether or not Mr. Reid's character stood in need of vindication prior to his appearance as an author, a farther and very different style of defence has been rendered necessary by his unfortunate Pamphlet.

Mr. Reid, it is said, is, and for a long time has been, ransacking

the records of the India House, with a view to the preparation of a series of special pleas, on behalf of that criminal at whose mercy the natives of Baroda believe him to be. His object, I am informed, is to make it appear that Nursoo Punt is an innocent and persecuted man, who has received injustice not only at my own hands, but at those of Mr. Frere, and the Court of Directors. Whatever casuistical skill can effect for so bad a cause, will doubtless be achieved by the author of those "cogent arguments" which overcame Lord Falkland's sense of right and wrong. And if, in the creditable undertaking which report assigns to him, he pay as little attention to consistency, to accuracy of quotation, to adhesion to facts, and to the canons of logic, as he has in his first essay at authorship, his brochure may appear to those ignorant of the merits of the case most satisfactory and conclusive.

But I would suggest to Mr. Reid, that though he may succeed in placing the friend of Nursoo in the India Council Board, more will be required of him ere he can repair that want of confidence with which the natives of India will certainly regard one who is not only considered by them as corrupt, but has himself deliberately rejected the only arguments which have been urged with a view to the vindication of his own reputation.

He must suggest some explanation of the fact, admitted by himself, that a belief in the corruptibility of British functionaries is deeply rooted in the native mind of western India. He must explain how it is, that the shrewd natives of Baroda have, year after year, remitted large sums to Bombay, to purchase favourable decisions from the authorities; how it is, that they consider themselves to have received an equivalent for their remittances; and by what means they were brought to regard himself as the especial friend of the most eminent of the bribe remitters—Nursoo Punt's "wealthy and wicked relative," Baba Nafra. Such explanation I endeavoured to afford, on a theory supported by facts and consistent with the assumed integrity of the authorities. And, as a pregnant illustration of my theory, I adduced the remarkable history of Nursoo Punt. But Mr. Reid has seen fit to repudiate the illustration, and *pro tanto* my theory; and

in so doing, he assumes the responsibility of explaining all those painful facts of which my theory alone afforded a satisfactory explanation, and which no amount of special pleading can efface.

He must explain how it came to pass, that, contrary to official usage, Nursoo Punt's irregularly transmitted petition of the 18th September, 1848, was received, with his concurrence; * that, though this petition reflected on my official conduct, the fact of its existence was withheld from me; † and that it was not only received and circulated, but formed the basis of a minute in which the unconscious Lord Falkland was made to express sentiments he did not entertain; to prejudge a case of which he knew nothing; and to propose the conferring on a man accused of official infidelity, a compliment rarely conferred on natives of even unblemished and unsuspected character. ‡ He must state what share he had in the conception of that extraordinary minute; and even should he disavow its inspiration, he must explain how it happened that he, so well acquainted with the corruption of Baroda, could agree to the pre-judgment of such a case, and consent, without enquiry, to place at the elbow of the new and locally inexperienced Resident, a man labouring under serious imputations; §—one whose demoralization he had five years previously forseen as a not improbable result of his transference to Baroda; and who, less than five years previously, had been brought under his official cognizance as related by family ties to the leading corruptionists at Baroda—to those very corruptionists with whom I had more than suspected him of being in criminal collusion—to those very corruptionists whose alleged misdeeds it was the duty of the new Resident to investigate—and, above all, to that *facile princeps* of the Baroda corruptionists, who had, so recently as 1840, been a party to the design entertained by the Guicowar to administer a bribe of £6000 to Mr. Reid himself.

Nor will it suffice for Mr. Reid to pretend that dread of the Fudkey alone made him accede to a proposal so totally opposed to

---

* Page 33.
† Page 34.
‡ Pages 34 to 38.
§ Pages 52 to 56.

English ideas of common justice and common sense—for it was competent for the Government to nominate whom they chose to the post which Nursoo had resigned.

And if Mr. Reid have that regard for his reputation, which at one time influenced myself, he will explain why he was so anxious to exclude from the office of Native Agent, the man who, of all others at Baroda, was least likely to play into the hands of the corruptionists—the man who had incurred their undying hostility, by the hearty and able manner in which he had exposed their misdeeds in former years—the man who had so recently enabled me to defeat the collusive artifices of that Nursoo, whose interests Mr. Reid was promoting, I will not say in a "tortuous," but certainly in a most extraordinary manner—the man whom the Bombay Government themselves now admit to have been unfairly dealt with,* and against whom Mr. Reid displays a startling personal vindictiveness and animosity. He must explain why it was that, though the pre-judgment to which Lord Falkland was committed bore date the 7th of October, not only was no intimation of it vouchsafed to myself, on whom it so seriously and so erroneously reflected; but the documents which could alone enable his Lordship to see the extent to which he had been committed, were sedulously kept from his Lordship's notice, till after the departure for Egypt of an officer, who, it was well known, would have thrown up his sick leave and immediately returned to Baroda, had he been aware of the nature of the strange and unparalleled proceedings that were in progress. He must satisfactorily explain the painful facts connected with Jeyrow's petition, and its detention in the Persian department,† not as these facts are erroneously detailed by him, but as they are fully stated and elucidated in the foregoing pages.‡ He must give a less self-contradictory exposition of the "Maurice Letter" than that

* Lord Falkland's Minute, dated 3rd of June 1852. Not in the Blue Books, but among the papers subsequently granted to Parliament on Mr. Otway's motion.

† At that time under the management of Mr. Reid's son-in-law.

‡ Chapter IV., commencing at page 57.

which is set forth in his Pamphlet; and he must consistently account for those facts and obvious deductions, in reference to that letter, which it has been my painful duty to detail.*

These are but a small part of the matters which it behoves Mr. Reid to explain; and his explanations must be very different in character, and kind, from those vouchsafed in his Pamphlet. If his ambition extend beyond securing that seat in the East India Direction, which he cannot desire for himself more earnestly than Nursoo Punt, and Nursoo's allies, desire it for him: if it be his wish, as it is undoubtedly his duty, to diminish that damage which he has himself been the cause of inflicting on the British name in Western India—(a damage which was very serious prior to the publication of his Pamphlet, and which that Pamphlet has enhanced)—*he must plainly and distinctly deny and disprove the imputations which the natives of Baroda have cast upon him, and other officials*, and so place the administrative functions of England in India on their just and proper foundations.

* Chapter V., commencing at page 83.

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

The demand for the last Edition of this pamphlet has made a new one necessary,—and I have taken the opportunity to correct some trifling errors of the press, and also to add several notes, in further elucidation of the narrative; and, in compliance with the suggestions of friends, considerably to enlarge some portions of it.

The interest awakened by this narrative, at home, I believe to be on the increase. At Bombay, the example set by the English press has had the effect of reviving, into even more than its pristine warmth, the Anti khutput agitation of 1850-1. For this I was prepared. But I must confess, that I did not look to see the decrepit government of that Presidency partaking of the generous impulse. A letter, received by the last mail, informs me, that the judges of the Sudder Adawlut, Messrs. Warden, Le Geyt, and Grant, have been required by government to declare, UPON OATH, the truth or falsehood of sundry fearful charges made against their integrity, by the dauntless and uncompromising editor of the *Bombay Gazette*. I am glad to hear it;—but then, why is Mr. Bell, himself so lately a Sudder judge, and still, as "the judicial member of Council," *ex officio* President of the Sudder, not included with the rest? Is it that, as in the cases of Craig, Evans, Smith, and Marston, (post pp. 59—60, 75a—7), so in this case, of the more important judges of the Sudder, every artifice is to be used, to confine inves-

tigation to the alleged offences of subordinate officials to screen from scrutiny those of the Government? Is it, perchance, that—because these judges have made themselves obnoxious to the censure of Government, they are now—in the teeth of the Bombay Government's "very proper intimation to the Guicowar (post p. 64), that they never take notice of paragraphs in newspapers"—compelled to purge themselves by oath of the accusations of the *Bombay Gazette?* It may well be so; for, certainly, of the three scapegoats there is not one, who is not obnoxious, and highly obnoxious, to the present members of the Bombay Government. Mr. Warden, having for a brief period in 1852 officiated as Member of Council, had, in that capacity, distinguished himself as the author of certain Minutes—the only able and honest ones, of a date subsequent to Mr. Willoughby's retirement, which are to be found in the Blue Books; and, in those minutes, he had strongly protested against the course taken in Colonel Outram's removal, and the contradictory pleas by which his colleagues attempted to defend it. Mr. Le Geyt, whose name is mentioned hereafter (p. 21) in connection with the seizure of the Dhackjee Dadajee papers, is certainly no friend to the cabal, by whose intrigues that measure was defrauded of its purpose; nor is he likely, as the relative of Sir George Anderson, to approve of the manner in which Mr. Reid has affected to shelter himself under the safeguard of the Governor of Ceylon (post 8). Of Mr. Grant—if it be not enough that he is the friend of the now odious Mr. Willoughby, and, by defending him, has incurred the undying enmity of Lord Falkland, and, direr still, of Colonel Melvill, the brother of the secretary to the Court (post p. 70), there is something further to say. It was he who placed in Colonel Outram's hands the treasonable paper, (post p. 78) which so deeply compromised the safety of their present favourite, Bhow Tambekur, minister to the Guicowar, and successor of Nursoo Punt in the good graces of the Bombay Government. It was

he whose uncompromising support of Baba Fudkee drew upon himself Nursoo Punt's hostility. It was he who incensed ALL the friends of that most puissant knave, by withstanding to his face the great Nursoo Punt himself.!

Still, as I said before, I welcom even this restricted enquiry; and with the motives of the actors I meddle not.

The appearance of the papers moved for by Mr. Otway, is looked for with more anxiety than ever, since the recent discussions of the India question in Parliament. It is difficult to see, what good the Court of Directors anticipate from thus keeping them back; for the only consequence will be to incite somebody to publish them illicitly, either in India or in England,—an expedient for which the universal corruption of their servants affords but too many facilities.

Within the last few days, for instance, I myself have been favoured with the perusal in—MS.—of one suppressed report—that of Mr. Luard, of the Judicial Department, in reply to the Khutput Circular of 1850; and of the correspondence which has ensued, and which is also suppressed. In that Report—handed up in 1850—Mr. Luard deliberately affirms his own belief, in the corruptibility of public men at head quarters, and refers, in support of it, to certain reports and evidence, all handed up by himself in 1846, and all unnoticed!

The last Bombay Mail brings me another of these suppressed papers—which has been printed *in extenso* there, in the columns of the *The Overland Telegreph and Courier* (12th Feb., 1853);—and, as it contains Colonel Outram's deliberate judgment of the high and irreproachable character of the persecuted Baba Fudkee—(against whom it suits the purpose of Mr. Reid ("Letter," etc. pp. 85—87) to reproduce the refuted insinuations of the respectable Nursoo Punt,—I have placed it in the Appendix to this Edition.

In compliance with a suggestion received from a high

quarter, I take this opportunity of referring to the able work of Sir William Napier, "The Conquest of Scinde" (pp. 269—71), for further corroboration of the unfavourable opinion now universally entertained of the character and conduct of the Bombay Government. The historian and his brother, Sir Charles Napier—opposed on nearly every other subject to the policy of Colonel Outram—appear to concur with him in his estimate of Mr. Lestock Reid.

I have also another and more grateful task,—that of acknowledging the handsome manner, in which this humble compilation—of what are truly said to be but "a few salient points" of a great case,—is mentioned, in a very able and interesting official biography of Colonel Outram, by an unknown hand,* which has issued from the press since my Third Edition was published.

INDUS.

London, 24th March, 1853.

* "A Memoir of the Public Services rendered by Lieut.-Col. Outram, C.B. London: Printed (for private circulation) by Smith, Elder, & Co., 65, Cornhill, 1853."

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

Two editions of this narrative having been exhausted, and a third being called for, I take the opportunity to say a few words on the success which has attended the two first.

In the first place, I have to thank the member for Stafford, Mr. Arthur Otway, for his ready compliance with the suggestion contained in my Letter to the President of the India Board (post. p. xi.), in so amending his Notice of Motion, as to include in the required Return of papers illustrative of Bombay corruptions, all documents which, like the Reports of Mr. Bettington, the Judge, and Mr. Hart, the Enam Commissioner, were handed in subsequently to 1840, but before the date of the Government Circular on Khutput. The zeal and perseverance of that gentleman, aided by the unhesitating readiness—may I hope, the real anxiety?—of the Right Honourable President of the India Board, to facilitate the exposure of intrigues, so disgraceful to the character of Indian Government, have resulted in an Order of the House of Commons, granted without opposition, and in the very terms of the notice thus amended, for the production of the papers in question. It is impossible to speak too highly of the conduct of Sir Charles Wood, in this instance, or to overrate that intervention of fortune, which disappointed Sir James Weir Hogg of his recent aspirations for the Presidency of the Board of Control.

The Court of Directors have shared in the good impression. If the tale of the Clubs (post p. 75) be true, the Chairman has lost his prestige, and their hearts are turning—they know not whither;—perchance to justice.

But the interest, which these pages have excited out of

doors, is not less remarkable. I have used scarcely any efforts to promote—none certainly to force—the circulation; and yet within the month every copy is disposed of, and a new issue is demanded. Public opinion is now fully directed to the painful importance of the subject, to which I have devoted my pen;—and the public opinion of England has terrors even for the oppressors of India. They cannot afford to brave the scandal here, as they have braved it at Bombay or Baroda. The tenure, by which their acquired position in English society has to be retained, is one of conditions;—and the principal of these is a respect for the reputation, which they are supposed to carry with them into it. It is not good for them *here* to treat, with affected indifference and real taciturnity, the charges of such men as Col. Outram—charges, supported by evidence so startling, so credible, and, withal, so utterly uncontradicted—charges, which, if but the tithe of them be taken as true, are the indelible stigma of their reputation, and their lasting disqualification for honourable intercourse. It may not be easy for them to deal with such charges. But they find it by many degrees more difficult to submit silently to such.

When I first assumed my pen, therefore, I had fully prepared myself to encounter the hostility of those who, lacking the legitimate means of self-defence in the real issue of battle, would prefer to take the lists against me in the character of assailants. I am now more than ever prepared,—now that Mr. Lestock Robert Reid has set them the example,*—for the appearance of a host of such antagonists. I will meet them all, as I now meet Mr. Reid; that is to say, not in any quarrel which they may seek to put upon me, but in mine own. I will not, at their bidding, change the ground

* "Letter to the Editor of the *Daily News*, in answer to certain remarks, contained in three chapters on Baroda affairs, which appeared in that Journal on the 23rd, 24th, and 25th December, 1852, and have since been republished in a pamphlet signed 'Indus.' By Lestock R. Reid, Esq., late Member of Council, Bombay. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1853."

which I have taken, nor adopt a private controversy in the stead of that of the commonwealth. What is germane to that great debate I will handle to the best of my ability; but I am not to be turned from my purpose, by personal invective, nor seduced into an impertinent polemic, by the introduction of new and irrelevant matter. Those, who peruse the present edition of this narrative, will perceive in what manner I have dealt with Mr. Reid; and they may assure themselves, that those who come after him shall receive no other treatment.

They will also be able to satisfy themselves, how far the compiler of this narrative has deserved the epithets which Mr. Reid has applied to him. Not that I complain of their coarseness in the slightest degree. They illustrate the dignity of the cause in which they are wielded, and the delicate sense, which its representative entertains, of his own honour and of that of his confederates. I should indeed be sorry and ashamed, to find myself an object of courtesy, to the friend and patron of the thrice-convicted Nursoo Punt. Mr. Reid complains bitterly that I, following the language of the official records, and quoting from Colonel Outram, have applied to that convict the "ungentle term of miscreant" (p. 22). Mr. Reid thinks that a person,—who has been thrice convicted, and at last degraded and punished, in the very teeth of his powerful employers, of wholesale and habitual bribery and taking of bribes—of betrayal of the secrets of office to the public enemy—of buying and selling justice—of aiding and abetting perjury, robbery, abduction, and child-murder—and of doing all this in the name of the British Government and its representatives, Mr. Reid himself being one of their number!—must not on any account be denounced as a "miscreant"! Be it so, Mr. Reid! After this confession of opinion, pray call me anything you please, so that it be not over courteous. I trust that I shall always deserve to be accounted—by the man who resents the imputation of rascality to his friend Nursoo Punt—"a dishonest concoctor of falsehoods, and libeller" (p. 1); "ignorant, rancorous,

mendacious, unfair, and malignant" (p. 2); "an industrious maligner of innocence" (p. 14); "an unscrupulous perverter of facts, and author of disgraceful falsehoods" (p. 64); "a distorter of expressions for his own purposes, a crafty and insidious enemy, and one who has successfully laboured to be despicable" (p. 68); "A SCURRILOUS PAMPHLETEER!" (p. 69); "an unprincipled and anonymous libeller, actuated by personal malice, or by an innately vicious inclination, to slander honourable men" (p. 70);* or, in fine, anything else—equal in kind—which Mr. Reid may think suitable, to mark his sense of the immeasurable distance, which separates my morality from that of his friend Nursoo Punt.

I shall not lose my temper, if Mr. Reid has lost his own; and I can make great allowances for the indiscreet but generous zeal of friendship. His continued attachment to the cause of the criminal, whom I have so grossly insulted by calling him a "miscreant," does honour to the steadiness of that friendship; and, certainly, never had man more need of such a friend than Nursoo Punt has at the present moment. I concur with Mr. Reid, in the pity he expresses for the convicted and punished culprit—although I do not at all concur with him in regretting the punishment. It is a hard thing to be a culprit, yet harder to be a convicted one—harder still to be punished. If Mr. Reid were to be convicted and punished to-morrow, as Nursoo Punt has been, I could find it in my heart to forget that garland of Elegant Extracts, which I have been culling from his pages for the edification of my readers, and to pity Mr. Reid.

Such being my Christianlike disposition towards Mr. Reid, I must only the more regret the utter failure of his present endeavour, to rid himself of his share of the common obloquy, which has so justly fallen upon the Bombay Government. He states, most truly, that I have never hitherto hesitated to express my conviction—a con-

* I may take this opportunity to say, that the citations from Mr. Reid to be found in the notes to this edition, are intended to have reference to his pamphlet.

viction solely based on the official acts of himself, his colleagues, and his successors—that, so far as he was concerned, the belief of the natives of India, as to the accessibility of Europeans to Khutput, was not unreasonable nor ill-founded. If I had, at any time, any hope that he might have it in his power to remove that impression, it is surely waxed very slender now, since my perusal of his pamphlet. Its allegations may be credited by the ignorant; the unreflecting may see in it a kind of *prima facie* vindication; the Athenæum club may have thought it an authority for withholding the apprehended black ball; and the intelligent constituency of the India House will, very probably, surmise that, after all, he is a very fit candidate, for a seat in the Court of Directors, by the side of the ex-Registrar of the Calcutta Supreme Court. But no man, be he friend or foe to Mr. Reid, who has read the papers, or is otherwise familiar with the case, to which this "Letter" of Mr Reid purports to be a reply, will hesitate to say, AT LEAST THUS MUCH,—that it leaves the case no better than it found it!

One word upon my own position, before I conclude these not uncalled-for observations. The *ton de guerre*, under which I write, was assumed, as my friends well know, from a feeling of delicacy towards Colonel Outram, and not from any desire of concealment. My publisher has always been at liberty to give up my name to the first enquirer; and I have reason to know that, to Mr. Reid,—notwithstanding his rant about the "Daily News" and its "anonymous correspondent," and so forth,—my identity has been well known, from the first appearance of the publications of which he complains. It is, doubtless, a convenient and an adroit method, that which he has adopted, of treating my pamphlet (re-written almost throughout, and enlarged to nearly twice its volume), as a mere reprint of certain articles in "a journal," from the pen of "an anonymous writer," and to rest his own case upon the assumption, that the accusations against him are all comprised within the compass of those articles, and that there are none beside.

them. But the subterfuge is flimsy and diaphanous. It is well known to Mr. Reid's friends, how he used to boast, that "if anybody would only dare to come forward and attack him in a pamphlet, he should soon have his answer; but that, so long as it was only an anonymous writer in a mere newspaper who libelled him, he certainly should take no notice of it!" It is difficult to imagine what advantage Mr. Reid can hope to derive from this palpable affectation of ignorance upon a subject so worthless. Equally hard is it to understand why Mr. Reid did not, whilst he was about it, postdate his manuscript by some months, instead of some weeks, before going to press;—were it only to give some air of plausibility to the first passage in his "Postscript" (pp. 68—9)!

I can only repeat, from the last passage in my letter to Sir Charles Wood, contained in my first Edition, "Adsum qui feci." I seek no concealment. In my own proper person I have elsewhere—aye, even on the floor of Parliament—proclaimed openly the convictions which I here present under the disguise of "Indus." Mr. Reid knows this well, and has shown,—by his scarcely delicate allusion to a matter, as to which no one but myself, who complain not, has any right to complain (pp. 65, 66),—that he not only knows it, but fully comprehends that nothing, but a sense of delicacy towards Colonel Outram himself, prevents me from proclaiming myself either his champion or his ally. What I have said in my two former Editions, I repeat now—I am neither the one nor the other. I have not consulted him, as to the course I have taken, or am taking, in this matter. I have never had any correspondence with him, directly or indirectly. I have not even the honour of his acquaintance. I am not quite sure that I have ever seen his face. At all events, for these pages I alone am responsible. ADSUM QUI FECI!

INDUS.

London, 10th March, 1853.

Letter prefixed to the First and Second Editions of this Pamphlet.

TO THE

RIGHT HON. SIR CHARLES WOOD, BART., M.P.,

PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF CONTROL, &c. &c. &c.

SIR,

You are a Member of the Imperial Parliament. You are one of the Select Committee, appointed by the Commons to inquire into the operation of the East India Charter. From 1846 to 1852, you were *ex-officio* member of a nonentity, called the India Board. You are now the occupant of real, supreme, and arbitrary power and government over India, under the title of President of that same imaginary Board. These are so many reasons which—were I to judge from the course which Indian and Colonial preferment has hitherto taken—might move me to the belief, that in the general ignorance and heedlessness which prevail, amongst public men in this country, on the subject of India, you, Sir, share in at least an ordinary degree.

In this view I presume to inscribe to you the accompanying pages. They comprise the substance of much that is contained in "the Outram Blue Books" of 1852, ordered by Parliament, on the motion of Mr. Anstey,—and more especially of Colonel Outram's own Reports of 1851-2 to the Bombay Government, on the spread of pecuniary corruption among its officers; with the correspondence, to which the preparation of those Reports, and the consequent dismissal of Colonel Outram from office, have led. All the references, therefore, which appear in the course of my narrative, relate to that parliamentary paper; unless where otherwise expressed.

In submitting this narrative to your notice, I earnestly invite you to consult the originals from which I have taken it. It is true that the labour is uninviting. Many important documents are altogether omitted; others appear only "in extract;"—the derangement of the rest has been dexterous,—and since the date of the Return, much new matter, necessary to the due comprehension of the old, must have accumulated in the

dark archives of the India House. But investigation is here a duty,—and, at this crisis of the inquiry into the whole scope of East India Administration, a duty of the first necessity; and the labour, though uninviting, must be faced. The Court of the Guicowar is but one scene in the wide-spread drama of corruption. If you, Sir, will take the trouble to inquire, you will find more than one parallel instance, in the state of our relations with the Court of the King of Oude. Other native states may furnish similar examples. The Government of Bombay is but a particular passage in the general scheme and working of your East Indian Government.

It was with the view of removing the difficulties, prepared for you by the mode of arrangement, that I undertook the following compilation of the documents already published. I trust that in this attempt I have, to some extent, succeeded. But the remaining difficulties are not to be so encountered. The missing documents must be restored to their place in the correspondence;—the mutilations made whole;—the continuations added. This duty, Sir, it is, for the present, yours, not mine, to accomplish; for your fiat alone can compel the production of these papers before the re-assembling of Parliament. I would fain believe that it is not with your sanction,—nor with that of your responsible subordinates, the Secretaries to your supposed Board of Control,—that members of the Court of Directors are going about, and boasting that "the production of more papers will not be consented to,—and that they have received strong assurances, at the office of the Board of Control, to that effect." But I cannot conceal from myself that, in that office, the practical authority is *not* exercised by the hands, in which it is vested by law, nor guided by the heads, which are alone responsible to Parliament.

It was, I suppose, under the same uneasy anticipation, that the notice of motion on this subject, standing in the books of the House of Commons, in the name of Mr. Otway, member for Stafford, was prepared by that gentleman. Mr. Otway has given notice, for an early day after the present recess, that he will move for the following papers, in continuation of those obtained in the last Parliament by Mr. Anstey:—

Copies of all Despatches, Minutes, or other Documents (not already laid before Parliament) relating to the attempts of Dhackjee Dadajee to bribe the Bombay Government and its servants:—Of all Reports or Replies (not already laid before Parliament) returned by Political, Revenue, or Judicial

Officers of the Bombay Government, to the Circular Letters on the subject of Khutput (illicit influence), addressed to them by the said Government in May 1850, with the dates on which they were received by the Bombay Government, the Indian Government, the Court of Directors, and the Board of Control respectively:—Of all Correspondence and Papers (not already laid before Parliament) on the subject of the said Circular Letters, or the said Reports or Replies, or the belief of the natives in the corruptibility of the Bombay Government or its subordinate officers, or the means of eradicating the same:—Of all Correspondence and Papers (not already laid before Parliament) on the subject of the conduct of the Bombay Government, in "arresting *in limine*" some of Colonel Outram's most important investigations of official corruption, as described in the Political Letter of the Court of Directors of the 23rd day of June 1852 (Parliamentary Paper, No. 560, of Session 1852, p. 17), or on the subject of the charges against Colonel Outram, contained in Minutes of the Bombay Government or its members, of labouring under "monomania" (Parl. Pa. etc. page 1285), or of being actuated by "rancorous personal feelings" (Parl. Pa. etc. p. 913), in his conduct of certain of those inquiries, which the Court of Directors afterwards declare to have been conducted, with a "zeal, energy, ability, and success," entitling him to credit (Parl. Pa., etc., p. 27):—Of all Documents on the Records of the India House, showing, or tending to show, the views of individual Directors, in reference to Colonel Outram's removal from office or in reference to the treatment he received from the Bombay Government, or in reference to the probable consequences of his removal, or interference to the measures, by which these consequences might be best averted:—Of all Documents tending to show, what measures have been taken by the Bombay Government, or ordered by the Court of Directors, for the purpose of eradicating the belief in the corruptibility of high officials, which has been declared to exist at Baroda, by Colonel Outram, and also by Mr. W. E. Frere, the Commissioner despatched by Lord Falkland's Government, to report on certain allegations made by Colonel Outram, and who furnished a Report, dated the 22nd day of October, 1851 (Parl. Pa. etc., p. 1013), and by other public servants:—And of all Documents, tending to show, if any and what measures have been taken, to effect the removal of, or convey censure to, the Minister and other members of the Guicowar's Darbar, pronounced guilty, by the Bombay Government, of having laboured to thwart Colonel Outram's legitimate and official inquiries, and to interpose difficulties in the way of his doing justice to oppressed individuals, entitled by guarantee to British protection (Parl. Pa., etc., p. 17, and p. 411).

With one trifling addition, the production of those papers will answer every purpose. I venture to suggest to the honourable mover—but, above all, to you, Sir,—the production of all reports on the subject of "Khutput," handed in, to the Bombay government from any of the specified departments, before the date of the circular letter named in the notice;—or some very important evidence will be excluded. The report, for instance, of Mr. Bettington, the judge of Ahmedabad, was received by the

Bombay government previously to the date of their circular letter, and indeed, as I have shown at p. 51 [first edition] of the following narrative, was the chief occasion which led to it.

I owe it to an already oppressed and injured gentleman, to say, that for these pages I am wholly and solely responsible;—and that they are published, not only without the sanction of Colonel Outram,—from whose views, indeed, I have, in more than one important instance, taken care to record my entire dissent,—but even without his knowledge. *Adsum qui feci:*—and those who question my act, shall receive a fitting answer.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

INDUS.

London, 7th February, 1853.

POSTSCRIPT TO THIRD EDITION.

I owe you, Sir, some acknowledgment, in the name of the Indian people, for the readiness with which you have consented to the production of the further papers in this case. Since the publication of the Second Edition of these pages, Mr. Otway's motion, amended in the way I ventured to suggest, has been made with your full concurrence, and the return has been ordered by the House. It only remains, Sir, that your spirited intentions shall not be defeated by the dull arts of Leadenhall Street; that the return so ordered shall be made without delay; and that Parliament shall not be allowed to legislate in the dark for the future Government of India. Before the great trust is renewed in its present hands, let us know how far they are worthy of any trust whatever. The frantic boasts, in which the Khutputites of the India House are even now indulging, that "the papers will not be printed, until after the Charter has been renewed," it lies, Sir, only with yourself to refute. Let the originals go to the printer, rather than that the miserable expectations of these men should be realised. The moment is critical; and every hour lost now will involve future years of unavailing regret.

London, 10th March, 1853

BOMBAY BRIBERIES:

A Tale of the present Charter.

CHAPTER I.

How His Highness of Gujerat came to think of Bribing the Bombay Government.

Gujerat is a native state, dependent on the East India Company. It is governed, nominally, by a Mahratta prince, called the Guicowar—but, in reality, by a Political Commissioner or Resident of the East India Company, attached to the Presidency of Bombay. Mischievous and anomalous as this kind of double government has ever proved to be, it is a great favourite with the India House; and, although it has been frequently and strongly denounced by men like Sir Thomas Munro, who have had the means to know India as well as the inclination to serve her, the abuse is too profitable to be given up; and the denunciation is allowed to pass unanswered.

Baroda is the capital of Gujerat, and the court of the Guicowar. The climate is most unhealthy; but the city is the resort of merchants and bankers possessed of consi-

derable wealth. The government is arbitrary and corrupt, the prince weak and indolent, his prime minister absolute. The Durbar or Cabinet is composed, for the most part, of persons dismissed from the service of the East India Company for their flagitious conduct. These are circumstances calculated to call into play the controlling authority with which the Resident of the Company is armed, for the prevention or punishment of injustice. His intervention is more especially in request when the injured party happens to be a British subject—or to be the holder of the Company's "bhandari" or guarantee, entitling him to the protection of its government; for by the "Regulation Law" of the Company, the possession of such a document, even by a subject of the Guicowar, confers upon him the character of a British subject. "Bhandaris" of this kind have been very largely granted during the last forty years; and the number of British subjects in Gujerat is now proportionally numerous.

For fifteen years before Colonel Outram's connexion with the service began, the Court of Directors had had constant occasion to deplore the growth of disorders in Gujerat, and to stigmatise with deserved severity the apathy or connivance of its own servants. The province of Mahee Kanta was particularly made the subject of animadversion. Property and life itself, say the Court, were unsafe—the laws were openly violated—authority was at an end—"the respect for the British name and character was lower than at any former period." It was to explore the causes and to attempt the redress of these evils, that Sir Robert Grant, in 1835, sent Colonel Outram into that district.

His office was that of "political agent"—("political," in

Anglo-Indian phraseology, always means "diplomatic"—under Mr. Williams, the then political commissioner. He found his new district in that "distracted" and "lawless" condition, and from the same causes (p. 1341), which, according to Sir Thomas Munro, have everywhere and always attested the presence of a Company's resident political commissioner. "The causes," Colonel Outram says, "were numerous. But the most influential of all was a deeply-rooted and wide-spread distrust of the British authorities, partly founded on certain decisions in cases of disputed succession, which were regarded by the native public as most unjust, and as having been obtained through the influence of bribery." That some of those decisions "were really unjust," he was "reluctantly compelled" to admit; yet he "continued to entertain an equally strong belief in the strict integrity of the British functionaries." Our readers will do well to pay particular attention to this statement, given in the gallant officer's own words; for the whole case is contained in it. Let us remark, that in 1853, as in 1835, the injustices complained of are systematic and unredressed. The native belief in the influence of bribery is stronger than ever: the Bombay government itself, accused on most "plausible grounds" (as Colonel Outram himself confesses), has shrunk from and stifled all inquiry: and the colonel still continues "to reconcile his conclusions with his equally strong belief in the integrity of the British."

In the prosecution of his inquiries, Colonel Outram became painfully acquainted with the existence of a corrupt monopoly of "political" power, enjoyed by the Brahmin Sarabhoy and his caste—the "Nagur" (Snake) caste, notorious for "subtlety, avarice, and unscrupulous-

ness"*—protected by the then political commissioner, Mr. Williams, who had made Sarabhoy his "confidential native agent." The whole caste shared in his good fortune. The political, judicial, and revenue establishments of not only Gujerat proper, but of the British districts of Ahmedabad (the head-quarters of the caste), Kaira, Broach, and Surat, were groaning under the administration of Sarabhoy, his sons, his relatives, and his clan. Their allies were powerful. The Bombay government fostered them. The Guicowar, for his own safety, made common cause with the Company's favourites. The great bankers of Baroda, the capital, were of course still more compliant. They were the "guaranteed" subjects of the Company; and that guarantee was all they had to look to for protection against the tyranny of the Durbar; and the Guicowar himself was one of their partners. They understood too well the precariousness of their position. Every demand of the Nagur officials was acceded to; through them "the bribes," says Colonel Outram, "were negotiated; and to that corrupt agency did I attribute the unjust decisions into which the British authorities had been betrayed: and events showed that I was right." Inquiries instituted by himself ended in the conviction of several of Sarabhoy's leading connexions, but not without difficulty; for the apprehension of the displeasure of the Bombay government prevented many from coming forward, as witnesses against a caste which monopolised its favour. If the general acceptance of the belief in "khutput" in Bombay (as corruption is

* Mr. Reid, naturally indignant at such imputations, retorts on Colonel Outram, in the name of his friends, the Nagurs, that he is ignorant of "Murattee and Gujerattee;" he (Mr. Reid) speaking well the first, which is that of THE GUICOWAR'S COURT (p. 7); and, withal, that he is also a malignant! (p. 9).

now styled there), was mortifying to him, much more did it grieve him to find his own government, to whom he had reported all the particulars of the case, confirming and encouraging the natives in their belief, by "the singular leniency with which government treated those servants whose guilt had been established."

The instances of "leniency" were generally of a most suspicious character. The following may be specified; for to give the whole would be to swell this pamphlet into a volume:—

1. "On Sarabhoy's resignation," says Colonel Outram (p. 1360), "Brijlall was, so to speak, the centre round which the other rogues rotated." He was the brother-in-law of that functionary, and therefore his successor in the post of "confidential native agent." One of the grossest of the cases already alluded to, in which corruption had been used to obtain unjust decisions, by English officials, of disputes touching inheritance, was traced home, by Colonel Outram, to Brijlall himself, and to another Nagur in the Company's service; and the facts of bribery and subornation of perjury, elicited by that gentleman, were so strong, that even his government found themselves compelled to reverse the decision in question, and to express their joy at being "enabled to escape becoming instrumental in the commission of a great act of injustice" (p. 1342). But the evidence against the two delinquents not being sufficiently complete to ensure a conviction—although quite sufficient to warrant the revision of the original cause—it was proposed by Colonel Outram to postpone all criminal proceedings, until that, by the favourable decision anticipated in the civil suit, the *prestige* of Nagur influence should have been shaken. That

proposal was accepted by the Bombay government. Their secretary informed Colonel Outram, that it was decided not to put the Nagurs upon their trial, until confidence had been restored, and encouragement afforded to the hesitating witnesses, by the reversal of the decision itself. Until that was done, the government professed to agree with Colonel Outram, that to publish the intention to prosecute would be to defeat the prosecution. On the 29th January, 1837, his suggestion to that effect was made; on the 29th July following it was adopted by government; and on the faith of that arrangement some further incriminatory evidence was procured by Colonel Outram, who handed it up on the 3rd September, and in person proceeded to Bombay. Whilst there, he was in constant communication with the government on the subject. But not a hint was given him then that the arrangement was to be departed from—far less any intelligence of what they themselves had been doing in Gujerat ever since he left it. It was not till long afterwards, that he found that, on the 12th of the month—"that is, as soon as he started for Bombay"—his superior officer, Mr. Commissioner Williams, had suggested—and that, within fourteen days after receipt of his letter, the government (till then so dilatory) had carried the suggestion into effect—that the two Nagurs should be put upon their trial without delay; and that the inquiry should take place—not at Sadra (where the crime was perpetrated), before Colonel Outram, nor even at Baroda, before Mr. Williams—but at Ahmedabad, the residence of the formidable Sarabhoy, and the chief seat of the Nagur power; and that the acting sessions-judge, Mr. Lumsden, was appointed to conduct it Still later was it discovered that Mr. Lumsden, at the same time,

was virtually forbidden to pronounce any sentence—or, in fact, to try the parties at all—and that his commission was limited to reporting the results of his "inquiry" to the Bombay government. The mock investigation took place—in the absence of the only officer who could have done justice to the imperfect proofs thus made public—months before the measure by which confidence was to have been restored, the reversal, namely, of the original decision. In the hesitating exoneration by government of Brijlall, the more powerful of the two offenders, their fellow-conspirators found the advantage of the terrors and the perjuries with which they had fenced their case. Mr. Lumsden, in reporting the results of the inquiry, recommended the prosecution of the witnesses who had forsworn themselves. But Mr. Secretary Reid, whose name will be found painfully connected with worse intrigues hereafter, declined the recommendation; stating, truly, "that they could not be arraigned, for the proceeding had been simply an inquiry, not a trial." Yet it was a significant conclusion of the business, that the re-hearing of the case was subsequently refused by the same government on the opposite ground of *non bis in idem;* viz., that the proceeding had been a trial, and not simply an inquiry (p. 1343).*

* Mr. Reid wishes the world to believe that he had nothing whatever to do with the Nagur cases. He says (p. 8) that they were all disposed of "between 1835 and 1838"—an assertion that is simply false. They lasted down to at least the 9th February, 1839 (post, p. 16, and Blue Books, pp. 1358—78), or about one year and a quarter after Mr. Reid's return to Bombay from the Cape of Good Hope; the date of which happy event he himself fixes (p. 6) on the 27th November, 1837. Equally false is his next statement. He says (p. 7), that "in the political affairs of Gujerat he NEVER TOOK THE LEAST INTEREST, until

The meaner of the two offenders had been too clearly implicated to escape; and his dismissal became a necessity. But even this tardy and insufficient measure was so contrived as to deprive it of all its value in the eyes of the natives and their Nagur tyrants. Contrary to all precedent it was notified, not publicly and in the *Gazette*, but by a private circular to each of "the authorities under the Presidency." Colonel Outram remonstrated, but in vain;

---

his accession to the Council [in 1841-2] obliged him to consider those (!) which came before him;" and that the said affairs, "THROUGHOUT HIS WHOLE CAREER AS SECRETARY AND MEMBER OF THE GOVERNMENT, were conducted, under the Governors and their Councils, by Mr. Willoughby." It is notorious that, from the 1st January, 1838, Mr. Willoughby, by leave of Governor Sir Robert Grant, had abandoned to Mr. Reid so much of the political functions with which he was still invested, as respected the affairs of Gujerat; and,—in its proper place,—the inconsistent Mr. Reid, very far from denying this fact, appears to confess it (p. 10). In June, 1838, again, the death of Sir Robert Grant left Bombay and Mr. Reid without a master. Mr. Reid, moreover, (p. 9) admits that several of the letters of 1838 "MAY bear his signature;" and he adds that the letter, quoted in the text, "is dated at a period when the political secretary, Mr. Willoughby, was with Sir Robert Grant in the Dekkan;" and that "others were issued at a time, when the same officer had been specially permitted to hold himself aloof from the disposal of those [Nagur] cases." Nevertheless, he thinks (p. 10) that the responsibility ought to rest with "the late excellent Sir Robert Grant, then Governor, and his able colleague, Sir George Anderson, now Governor of Ceylon!" Mr. Reid very well knows that the former left everything to the Council and Secretaries, and that his sleepy-headedness was the standing joke of the service. He, however, is dead, and Mr. Reid may vouch him safely. Why Sir George Anderson, of all the members of Government, should be made the scape-goat of delinquencies in which he had no part, Mr. Reid does not explain. But it is not uncharitable to surmise, that the distance of his present domicile indicated him as a not inconvenient witness.

and the natives of Gujerat saw in the unprecedented indulgence to the Nagurs, "a new illustration of the secret power they exercised over the members of government!" (p. 1844.)

2. But Brijlall's adventures were not yet ended. At the very period when Mr. Lumsden was engaged in the mock enquiry of Ahmedabad, not less than six distinct and well supported charges against him, of bribery and other crimes, were being prepared and sent up to Bombay, by Mr. Malet, the officiating commissioner, and Mr. Sutherland the commissioner himself. Doubtless the untoward conclusion of Mr. Lumsden's enquiries very materially injured the case of the new charges, by discouraging the witnesses; and the "leniency" of government, in declining the usual course of notifying, through the Gazette, the dismissal of Brijlall's accomplice, had enabled that person and his confederates, to represent his dismissal as a voluntary retirement from a service, in which he had been most unfairly treated (p. 1368). Still evidence enough remained, after all these discouragements, to convict Brijlall on every one of the six new heads;—an extraordinary fact, when the power of the man is remembered, and the facility with which Indian witnesses are intimidated and coerced into perjury. Moreover, every opportunity of tampering with the evidence had been procured for him, through the direct agency of the Bombay Government. Mr. Malet, for the better protection of the witnesses, had committed him and an accomplice to close custody, at the Residency, on reporting the charges for trial. With the speed of lightning, there came down an order from Bombay, directing that he should be merely confined to his house, under the charge of the Guicowar's peons or constables,—an order, which every one

must have known, "only involved," as Colonel Outram says, (p. 1363) "mulcting the accused of the small sum of money, that would suffice to bribe the peons placed over them, and thus to have as ample facilities for tampering with evidence, as if they had remained in the city." Nevertheless there remained, we repeat, enough and more than enough for the conviction of the offenders; and Mr. Sutherland, who had been expressly appointed to investigate the charges, reported them proved, and recommended "that the accused should be dismissed the public service, and publicly declared unworthy of serving government again in any capacity." This had been the invariable course in such cases; for the only exception to it was the former case of Brijlall himself. Light as such punishment must appear, it was the only one which could be applied to the case in hand. The offence had been committed in Gujerat. Had it been committed by a judicial or revenue officer within the British territory, the offender, on conviction, would have been liable to the further penalty of seven years' imprisonment. But, for some unexplained reason, the Government had adopted another policy for the extra-territorial delinquencies of its political servants; and, in their case, simple dismissal, notified in the Government Gazette, had been ever considered a sufficient chastisement. It is true, that some *thirteen years* after the events had occurred of which we are speaking, a new "Regulation" on the subject was wrung from them, by the importunities of servants inconveniently jealous of the public honour; and the act No. 37, of 1850, appeared. But the change is not worth speaking of, except to show the insincerity and hollowness of the government. Bribery is an offence against the criminal law. Yet this "Act of 1850," whilst

it trammels the Court of Enquiry with every difficulty of a technical kind, confers no criminal jurisdiction!

Inadequate as such a punishment must have appeared, the Bombay Government nevertheless avoided, to the last moment, the dismissal of Brijlall from the confidential office he had so grossly abused; and, when circumstances became too strong for them so that they could resist no longer, they still refused to make the dismissal known in the usual manner—through the Government Gazette. On this point they remained perfectly obdurate. It was in vain for Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Malet, and Colonel Outram, to point to precedent, or to remind them of the ill consequences that had resulted from the recent deviation from that precedent. Brijlall was dismissed—but *privately*, and by *circular letter*, and in such a manner as to enable the Nagurs to represent the removal as the voluntary act of Brijlall himself. "It was," says Colonel Outram (p. 1369), "in the estimation of Mr. Sutherland a suicidal act on the part of the British Government, supereminently calculated to promote the views of those who lived on the doctrine of Khutput, and to impress the natives with a belief, *that Brijlall had powerful friends in Bombay, who would hazard any amount of partizanship, in order to secure him from the minimum punishment.*"

8. Not discouraged by the result, Colonel Outram attempted to obtain the investigation of the conspiracies and perjuries, which had defeated justice. He was again unsuccessful. With one exception, the offenders were gratified with total impunity; and even that exception was merely nominal. It was the case of a district magistrate, who had superadded to subornation of perjury at Ahmedabad the minor offence of insulting Colonel Outram in his own court (or Cutcherry). That contempt of court

having been very properly referred by Colonel Outram to government, instead of punishing it himself, government was compelled to interfere; and it did interfere, by inflicting a nominal fine, and an "admonition," but some six months afterwards, and in the following manner:—"No apology to me," says Colonel Outram (p. 1347), "was required of him. No measures were taken to make the punishment known to those, in whose presence he had insulted me. He was to receive his admonition at Baroda, 130 miles from my court, where his offence was committed; and he had it in his power to represent his journey to Baroda, as a visit of honour to the commissioner, paid at the invitation of that officer."

4. In 1838, a British subject was imprisoned by the Guicowar, illegally, and at the instance of the near relative of the head karkoon (clerk) in the political commissioner's office. Bail was tendered, but in vain. The officiating political commissioner (Mr. Malet) addressed a remonstrance to the Guicowar, but the document was quietly suppressed by the karkoon. In the meantime, the prisoner was seized with a mortal sickness—the Guicowar denied him the medical attendance and aid, which Mr. Malet offered—and he was carried off by a speedy, convenient, and suspicious death. The guilt of the karkoon then came to light; and Mr. Malet immediately suspended that officer, and reported the case to government. With a celerity not often manifested in their correspondence, Mr. Malet was ordered to release him from his suspension, on the ground that it "was not improbable that he had no corrupt motives." At this juncture, the office of Resident of Baroda was conferred on the late Mr. Sutherland. That gentleman found himself in the same year also compelled by that head karkoon's "unworthy conduct," to dismiss

him; and, the government for once dared not reverse the decision. But they took their *revanche*. Mr. Malet had discovered that another of his officials had been guilty, not only of bribery, but of very extensive and dangerous conspiracies; and he imprisoned him, pending the investigation into the latter. In defiance of Mr. Malet's representation—that the inquiry would be defeated if he were set at large—he was ordered to set him at large; the inquiry was defeated; the greater criminals escaped; and the simple dismissal of that meaner one was the only atonement obtained by justice (p. 1352).

5. Lieut. Ramsay, holding the military command of Nandode, to which the political agency of Rajpeepla, in Gujerat, was annexed, had preferred, in 1835, charges of bribery and corruption against the head karkoon of that agency. Those charges were partly investigated, and recorded as probable, in Mr. Erskine's report of the 11th January, 1836. The guilt was matter of notoriety in the district; and Mr. Ramsay himself was offered a bribe of 10,000 rupees, by the accused, to stay proceedings. He continued to prosecute the inquiry, with the certain prospect of success. But, within twenty-seven days after Mr. Erskine's report, the Bombay government—never tardy on such occasions—published a general order, by which two military commands, of which Mr. Ramsay's military command was one, were suppressed; and the political control of Rajpeepla was transferred to the political commissioner's first assistant. Notwithstanding this treatment, Mr. Ramsay was still anxious not to lose the honour, of "the exposure of so foul and gigantic a system of corruption, which had brought the British name into odium and contempt." He besought the political commissioner, (Mr. Williams) to allow him to remain for a short

time at Rajpeepla, and prosecute his charges; the commandant of the other suppressed command having been, by the very terms of the order of suppression itself, allowed to retain his command for five months and upwards, whilst Mr. Ramsay, on the contrary, had been ordered to rejoin his regiment without delay. But the application was refused; and Mr. Ramsay was forced to depart. The accused was thereupon declared, by Mr. Williams, to be honourably acquitted of the first charges preferred by Mr. Ramsay. That of offering to Mr. Ramsay a bribe was not gone into at all. A passage in Mr. Erskine's report, already alluded to, explains these dark proceedings. He says, that it had been proved, to his satisfaction, that the officers in charge of the agency had been in the habit of putting their signatures to blank receipts, tendered by the accused Karkoon! Mr. Ramsay himself being free from blame in the transaction, it was not convenient to enquire into it too narrowly;—and the removal of that officer again enabled the Nagurs to defeat justice, and to celebrate their triumph. But, in 1838, new crimes of the villain whom they favoured were again pressed upon the government. Mr. Sutherland, who was now the Resident at Baroda, had instituted inquiries, which left him in no doubt of the matter, and had reported them to the government;—apprising them at the same time of the state of his office, crippled by the corruption of the *employés*, and the necessity of removing nearly every official. "I every day," writes that lamented officer (p. 1366), "feel my usefulness circumscribed, and am harassed and impeded in the discharge of important duties, *from having no inferior officer on my establishment in whom I can confide.* Indeed there are several enquiries and other matters I am prevented entering upon, *until I am allowed to employ a person whom I can*

trust, without the fear of being betrayed." It was well known to the government, that Mr. Sutherland was actually obliged, in this state of things, to take upon himself the functions of translator and copying clerk, in addition to his higher duties (p. 1364). In reply to this communication, his Bombay superiors drily desired him, "to lay the *full* evidence before government, together with the *full* defence of the accused parties." The Nagurs knew, says Colonel Outram (p. 1350), "that the government were well aware of the crippled state of Mr. Sutherland's establishment at this time, and they doubtlessly pointed to such a requisition, coming at such a moment, as another proof of their sympathy with the criminals, whom their servant was endeavouring to bring to justice." That requisition appears, in fact, to have done its work. For certain it is, that, from that date, no further notice of the case exists on the records of the Residency, nor has any further explanation been suffered to transpire. At a subsequent period, however, two fresh charges of conspiracy and corruption, against the same offender—well supported by evidence, and of which one in particular seemed such as to ensure his punishment—were reported by the Resident. What did the government do? They investigated the least certain of the two charges separately—declared it to be one of "doubt"—directed his simple dismissal, without "publicly declaring him incapable of ever again serving government"—and, having done so, dismissed the more glaring charge, with the remark that, "he having been already discharged from the public service, no further proceedings against him appear called for."

On this decision becoming known at Baroda, (says Colonel Outram) the accused obtained ready acceptance for his state-

ment, that he had procured it by direct corruption at Bombay. "The Guicowar himself, who, like his courtiers, had been an attentive observer of the proceedings of the Bombay government, gave credit to the assertion. He had, he thought, seen enough to satisfy him, that the Bombay government, far from viewing, with the abhorrence expressed by the local officers, the corruption which the latter had endeavoured so zealously to uproot, was itself under the thraldom of that corruption. He consequently took measures, in 1840, scarcely a twelvemonth after these events, to bribe the authorities, by a wholesale system of mercenary seduction; the particulars of which were brought to light in the well-known Dhackjee Dadajee's affair; and this Motee Lal Purshotum (the head Karkoon in question), whose influence with persons in authority at the Presidency had, in the Guicowar's opinion, been demonstrated by the favour shown to him by government, was selected by his highness, as one of the principal agents to be employed in the nefarious attempt."—pp. 1348—59).

How he sped in the enterprise—how well satisfied the Guicowar and his courtiers are to this day with the fruits of their pecuniary investment in that quarter—how meekly those high officers of the Bombay government, who are said to have shared the profit, have submitted to the disgrace of the scandalous transaction—how indignantly they have resented and chastised every chivalrous endeavour, on the part of their native and European subordinates, to defend or avenge their honour against the accusation—and how industriously the Court of Directors have laboured to hush up the whole matter, we shall see in the our next chapter.

CHAPTER II.

How his Highness of Gujerat set about bribing the Bombay Government

We have seen that all the great bankers of Gujerat had been, for many years, the agents of his Highness, in the corruption of the British Residency at Baroda. The same agency, he thought, might be equally useful at Bombay. That they enjoyed the undiminished favour of the Bombay government, there could be no doubt. That their corrupt doings were, nevertheless, perfectly well known to that government, was equally clear. A long and strictly confidential correspondence, between the Bombay government and Messrs. Sutherland and Malet, (the first gentleman being the Company's Resident at Baroda, and Political Commissioner in Gujerat, and the latter holding the inferior post of Assistant Political Commissioner in the same territory), had established both propositions to his Highness's satisfaction. We say, "to his Highness's satisfaction," because this strictly confidential correspondence had all leaked out (pp. 1372-3), in its due course, through the corrupt hands of the *employés* at the Baroda Residency, the pets of our Bombay government.

Of all the banking-houses in his capital, that of Hurree Bhugtee appeared to his Highness to be, in every respect, the best adapted to the present emergency. It was by far the most wealthy; and it enjoyed the continued guarantee of the East India Company; a guarantee entitling the firm

itself, and every individual partner, to the protection and support of the Bombay government. It was true that the guarantee, originally conferred on that house, had expired many years previously, and that its renewal by Mr. Elphinstone had not been unconditionally granted. It was true that the principal condition, stipulated for the Company, was "the good behaviour" of the bank. It was true that that stipulation was framed, with a particular regard to the probabilities of corruption; his late Highness, in whose time the guarantee had been given, being himself "a sleeping partner" in the house. It was true that the damning proofs, of that house's direct participation in the scandalous and avowed corruption of the Residency officers, forwarded by Mr. Malet and Mr. Sutherland from Baroda, had long been in the hands of the Bombay government. But it was equally true, that the zealous endeavours of those servants, to obtain from their masters at Bombay, the withdrawal of the Company's guarantee from those who had thus abused it, were entirely unsuccessful (pp. 1360-75). Not only so, but, in refusing to take advantage of the forfeiture, the Bombay government deprived them of all power to prosecute further inquiries —gave them such directions, for their future guidance, says Colonel Outram, as must have satisfied the natives "that government were rather averse to allow their local officers to trace out corruption, by reference to banking-house accounts" (p. 1373),—and announced that, in no case whatever of charged corruption or misconduct, should the books of a guaranteed house be seized, nor, in case of non-production, the guarantee be withdrawn from it, "unless it were clearly shown, that a reference to the books was necessary, to clear up any specific point involved

in the guarantee;" (that is to say, unless the bribery itself was specifically involved in the guarantee): and that, even then, no such reference could be necessary, if "the accounts had been long since closed;" a condition, of which it is difficult—for the uninitiated—to gather the meaning (pp. 1371-2). All this was known to the Guicowar, and also to his Highness's subjects. "They regarded it," says Colonel Outram (p. 1372n.), "as a significant fact, that the decision of government in respect of bankers' books, as well as their abolition of the system of proclaiming public servants, should both have been adopted at the time when Chotum Lall got into trouble." It is probable that our readers will take the same view with the men of Gujerat, in that respect, when we inform them, that this gentleman "in trouble" was not only himself of the favoured Nagur caste, but was the notorious Sarabhoy's own brother; and that his prosecution was "one of the earliest entered on, against the Nagurs," by the Company's unsuspecting servants! What follows is still more significant.

It was in 1838, that this change of doctrine and system was adopted, in favour of the "guaranteed" house of Hurree Bhugtee. But in 1843,—when the case for decision was that of another Baroda banker—"not guaranteed by, nor the subject of, nor under obligations to, the British government,"—it became similarly known to the natives that, for acting in strict conformity with the previous decision in Chotum Lall's case, and for not requiring, under pain of displeasure and punishment, the production of the bankers' accounts, the then Resident at Baroda (Mr. Boyd), was severely reprimanded by that same Bombay government (pp. 1372-3). It is true that then Sir James Carnac was

gone, that Lord Falkland had not yet come, and that Sir George Arthur was governor. The iron will and unflinching honesty of that high-minded servant compelled the reversal of their policy, in that particular instance, from his reluctant council.* It was the case of Dhackjee Dadajee—twice subsequently brought before parliament—and twice saved from exposure there, by the reliance of the movers upon the unhesitating, and we must add, the unperformed pledge of Sir James Weir Hogg, to produce the records of the corruption. When Mr. Anstey moved for the Outram correspondence, Mr. George Thompson drew attention to the breach of promise, and Sir James Weir Hogg undertook,

* "The proceedings of 1842-3," says Mr. Reid (p. 13), "exhibit a most indignant and summary vindication of the character of the Government"; but he takes care not to add, that they were due to Sir George Arthur alone;—and that if, as he goes on to say, "they ended in no absolute discovery," the failure was due to Khutput! The Council were opposed to them,—so were the Secretariat,—so were the Department of Police,—and the timely notice, which Dhackjee Dadajee received, enabled him to frustrate the warrant of the Governor, and to remove the more important of the criminating documents. So little faith had Sir George Arthur in their honesty of purpose, that he concealed from them his resolution by every means in his power,—we quote from the uncontradicted authority of the *Bombay Times*,—until the eve of execution. But it transpired; and the favoured name of Danvers is coupled with the transaction. "The papers," says Mr. Reid (p. 11), "were seized"—that is, the papers, *minus* all those of which his confederates had effected the removal. With the exception of one, the papers that were seized were comparatively of little consequence,—and that one had been accidentally overlooked. The name of a certain Secretary and Member of Council was implicated by that document; and, I believe, it never reached Sir George Arthur, nor yet the Court of Directors! I could have wished to hear Mr. Reid's own account of these transactions, familiar to the Bombay press,—that the world might know, whether the Dhackjee Dadajee papers, about to be laid before Parliament, are likely to include that all-important document! If not, I would

for the last time, that the papers should appear in the same volume with those moved for by Mr. Anstey. They are still suppressed! Sir George Arthur's minutes—those of Mr. Crawford, the Member of Council who supported him—those of Mr. Howard, Acting Advocate-General—would have illustrated the corruptions of 1843, as the corruptions of former and succeeding years are illustrated in the papers before us;—and every one of those all-important documents is—we repeat it—suppressed!*

---

strongly recommend the parliamentary friends of India to demand a local enquiry at Bombay itself. It is understood that Mr. Le Geyt, of the judicial department, is able and willing to give every information, if required by competent authority. Mr. Reid "is not familiar with the circumstances of this case!" (p. 11). If he means the "case" of Dhackjee Dadajee and his attempted bribery, his ignorance is little creditable to his sense of personal reputation. If he means the "case" of the action, which Dhackjee Dadajee brought (p. 11) against the Government for the seizure of his papers, and in which he was nonsuited,—a "case" which ought to have much interested Mr. Reid, a member of the prosecuted Government,—a "case" much discussed in all Bombay circles, and by the entire press,—a "case," "the facts of which," quoth Mr. Reid himself (p. 12), "as they are now known, were then known, and were declared openly in the Supreme Court,"—all that I can say is, that the assertion is not only incredible, but irrelevant.

* It has been already stated (pref. p. i.), that the production of these papers has been again ordered by Parliament, on the motion of Mr. Otway. The friends of Dhackjee Dadajee—and he has very influential friends even in London!—are circulating, with much confidence, the assurance that the papers will be delayed at the India House for many months, and that the fate of the new Charter Act will be decided before they are in the hands of the public. It is very probable, indeed, that the device will be resorted to. Mr. Reid, again, now that the order has been issued, professes (p. 69) to participate in my deep anxiety for the production of these papers. It is a pity that he had not long ago intimated that wish to his colleagues and successors at Bombay, and to the authorities at the India

Let us here remark, once for all, that we have neither the means nor the inclination to ascertain, with whom rests the guilt of the suppression of many important papers, omitted from this Outram Blue-Book. It may rest with the Bombay government. It may rest with their honourable masters at the India House. It may rest with the Board of Control. We know—from the papers that are published—what great and unaccountable delays have occurred, in the transmission of Colonel Outram's most urgent appeals to the India House—in cases too, where an early and even an immediate decision was declared to be of the first necessity. There was the very gross case, for instance, of Govind Rao Guicowar (pp. 1406-34). In that case, Baba Nafra had been guilty of constructive forgery, and was afterwards stigmatised as such by the Court of Directors; although the corrupt influence of his accomplice, Nursoo Punt, and the alleged protection of Mr. Reid, had screened him from censure at the hands of the local authorities. Colonel Outram's recapitulations of the charges, the evidence, and the correspondence in that case, were not sent home by the Bombay government until thirteen months and a half after Colonel Outram's appeal had been presented; nor even then, until it had leaked out that their own Commissioner, Mr. Frere, had found the charges substantiated, instead of, as it was perhaps hoped, deciding,

---

House, ever anxious to serve Mr. Reid. Had he done so, "the arrest *in limine*" (Blue Books, p. 17) of so many of the most important investigations instituted by Colonel Outram into the corruptions of the Bombay Government, would not have taken place; and the Blue Books would have been neither mutilated of their most valuable numbers, nor crippled by the displacement of those which have been left!

that Colonel Outram, with whom he had formerly been at variance, had failed in the proof. Mr. Frere's correspondence in this case, by the way, is entirely suppressed in the same collection. In another case again—the Ghorajee Pol frauds—there occurs a delay of sixteen months and a half in the transmission of the papers. Of the papers in general—whether contained in the Blue-Book or not—the greater number were not sent home until Colonel Outram's dismissal had made further concealment impossible. It is perfectly clear, that the object was to screen the guilty and the exalted;—and, in that view, it becomes immaterial to examine, whether the Home government alone, or, the Bombay government with its connivance, have *burked* the missing documents. But to return to our history.

All things considered, we cannot but applaud the discernment of the Guicowar, in selecting the house of Hurree Bhugtee as the medium of negotiation. The choice of agents in the enterprise was equally felicitous.

In our last chapter, we have done full justice to the qualifications of the principal agent, Motee Lal Purshotum. In common with the majority of the Guicowar's Durbar (or ministry), the man had been in the service of the Bombay government, and had been dismissed from that service, for crimes forced by others upon its unwilling attention. He had been, at the same time, singularly indulged by the hand which punished. The extent of that indulgence will never be known, if the Dhackjee Dádajee papers, to which Colonel Outram boldly appeals (p. 1360) are to be for ever suppressed. But, on re-perusing our last chapter, our readers will feel, that enough has transpired, to justify the imputations he casts upon the "excessive indulgence," shown

to the villain, both in respect of "stern justice and of wise foresight;" and that the Guicowar also was not very greatly to blame, if, in selecting Motee Lal for "this piece of rascality," he had paid some regard to the fact, that Mr. Willoughby was at that time the head of the Political Secretariat, whose clerk, according to the Acting Advocate-General's report of the 31st of January, 1843, Motee Lal himself had been, and "in whose department the Guicowar's affairs were transacted."

The late Mr. Sutherland was still alive, and doing his part nobly at Baroda, as British Resident. His murder had been, perhaps, plotted; but corruption was a safer and a milder method; nor was it until the utter failure of their attempts to corrupt him had satisfied the villanous agents of the hopelessness of such, that the more effectual way of poison was resorted to. He died on the 11th June, 1840. Some time previously, but in that year, Motee Lal appeared at Bombay. He was accompanied by one Mahadeo Bhow Pooranuck, "chosen with himself to approach Mr. Willoughby," and also by Dhackjee Dadajee, "whose long intimacy with Sir James Carnac," says the Acting Advocate-General's report, "naturally pointed him out as the fitting channel of reaching the late Governor of Bombay;" and who, we may add, afterwards, as we learn from a mysterious letter of the Court of Directors (pp. 31, 2), turned to excellent account, in his own behalf, the experience so honourably acquired in the service of his master. Their mission was to be a secret one. "Little hope existed of getting rid, by open negotiation, of the distasteful requisitions, that were being pressed upon the Guicowar," by men of the mould of Mr. Sutherland. The three agents were, therefore, "authorised to communicate,

that his Highness had formed the design, of bribing largely those members of the Bombay government, who were in a position to give effect to his wishes; and that two of his most confidential ministers were prepared to expend money, for the above purposes, if matters could be arranged." Negotiations appear to have ensued; but the grounds of Mr. Howard's statement are, as usual, suppressed. No evidence, *pro* or *con*, is suffered to reach the public. Howsoever unwilling to believe that such things are, or—which is nearly equivalent—that the statement of such is not susceptible of disproof, we are forced to content ourselves with the following extract, brief and cool, from Mr. Howard's official report, and to condescend to the suspicion, that there must be at least some truth in the shocking and unrepelled accusations:—

"The sums ultimately authorised, as Heera Lal (the head native agent under Mr. Sutherland) states, on the supposition that successful negotiations had been made with the undermentioned gentlemen, were as follows:—

To Sir James Carnac	1,000,000 rupees
To Mr. Willoughby	250,000 „
To Mr. Reid	60,000 „
To Shree Crustna	36,000 „
To Dr. Brown* and all the minor parties	110,000 „
Total	1,456,000."

Messrs. Willoughby and Reid having passed through the usual stages of preferment, ultimately reached the

* This *employé* is also related to one of the first-named officials.

council at Bombay; of which body the former gentleman continued to be a member until April, 1851; the latter until March, 1849. Both have since left India; and the latter is now canvassing for the Directorship of the East India Company. In the proceedings of the Bombay government, with reference to the Baroda corruptionists, their names constantly present themselves, and, always as opposed to inquiry, where opposition is possible; or, at least, where that cannot be evaded, as opposed to severity in chastisement. Mr. Malet, the once fearless political commissioner of Gujerat, succeeded his father-in-law, Mr. Willoughby, in the post—which he still fills—of secretary to the political and secret department of the Bombay government. The elevation of position seems to have contracted his views, instead of expanding them. Himself "so conversant with Baroda matters, and who had suffered so much inconvenience from Baroda intrigue," as Colonel Outram not unfairly taunts him (p. 1471), it is nevertheless by him that the dishonest policy of his former opponents in council chamber is carried out, even to the ruin of Colonel Outram, and of all who follow him in the path of duty in which he trod. Between Mr. Malet, the unmarried political commissioner, and Mr. Malet, the chief secretary and son-in-law, there is a great gulf fixed.

Mr. Willoughby was, at this time, the superior officer to Mr. Reid, who filled the post of secretary to the revenue department; and probably on that account the larger sum was allotted to him in the proposed distribution. But the people of Baroda were not aware, at that time, that his brother-secretary was in reality the more influential of the two. Mr. Willoughby, indeed, signed the letters on Baroda affairs, but had "carefully abstained from giving opinions"

on the affairs themselves. The letters bearing his signature were not drafted by him, and "the measures and doctrines propounded in those letters, were not of his inspiration" (p. 1379). It appears that the duties, thus abandoned by Mr. Willoughby, were, in fact, performed by his colleague, Mr. Reid (pp. 1405—6).*

The money was paid by the Guicowar. But was it received by those intended to be the recipients? His agents affirm the fact. We have the two volumes of papers before us; and, amongst them, there is not one, in which the Bombay government have denied the statement. The suppressed documents would throw light upon the subject. But then, why are they suppressed? The Guicowar considers that he has had value for his money; and the sincerity of his conviction is attested, by the punctuality of his subsequent payments. Year by year ever since, he has continued to make the advances required by his Bombay agents; and he continues to entertain the opinion, that he receives a fair consideration in return. His ministers openly vaunt, and his people believe, that he has bought up our government, and holds it at his disposal. At Bombay, with few exceptions, the press reiterates the statement; and men of character scruple to declare it to be untrue—much less to deny that the people and government of Gujerat have good reasons for their belief, that the efforts of the Resident, to vindicate the purity of British justice, "are viewed with disfavour and alarm by his superiors" (p. 1483).† These dishonour-

* Mr. Reid tries to evade this statement, but virtually confesses it to be true (pp. 31, 32. Compare pp. 6, 9—10).

† It is monstrous for Mr. Reid to pretend (p. 11), that, "in those days, no one thought for a moment of assuming that such sums ever reached the parties indicated." Nearly every one believed that

ing imputations are, from time to time, made known to the government at Bombay, and that government submits to bear them. It does worse. It renews its public tokens of favour, towards all those natives or Europeans who have asserted its corruption; and it pursues, with deprivation and disgrace, all those who have endeavoured to defend its honour, against imputations, which itself was contented to bear, and to eradicate the impressions, which its conduct had but too well justified.

---

they did; although few, "in those days," dared openly to avow their belief. There was at that time but one paper of any credit at Bombay, the *Bombay Times;* and its editor was then but new to India, and ignorant of Indian affairs, and the character of Indian Government, and, withal, a constant guest of Messrs. Willoughby and Reid, and also at Government House. Public opinion was without an organ; and the guilty found it not unsafe to circulate, although quite impracticable to obtain acceptation for it, the absurd and ridiculous figment, now again brought up by Mr. Reid, that the world-wise Dhackjee Dadajee and his wily Brahmins,—with their live-long experience of the Europeans, and the European system of government, and, above, all, their familiarity with the persons at the head of that Government,—were in fact choused of their money, by a few vulgar and ignorant conductors, clerks, and runners, who personated the Carnacs, the Willoughbys, and the Reids, or falsely boasted of having the ascendancy in their Councils. *Credat Judæus Apella!* At all events, on this point, let the world suspend its judgment, until the Dadajee papers are produced.

CHAPTER III.

How the Bombay Government behave, to those who would bribe them.

Fortunately for Dhackjee Dadajee and his accomplices, the unpurchaseable Colonel Outram was absent from Gujerat, during the whole of the intrigues narrated in the last chapter. In October, 1838, he had applied for permission to resign his appointment of Political Agent in the Mahee Kánta, that he might join the expedition about to be led into Affghanistan, by Sir John (now Lord) Keane. The permission was granted, and he took his departure from Gujerat. But, before doing so, he made one last effort to arrest the mischiefs, which were being wrought by the Bombay Government of the day. Of that Government, he demanded the assurance,—"that it would at length arise, put forth its strength, and utterly crush the corruption it had hitherto so leniently dealt with" (p. 1378): adding that, without such an assurance, it was "his determination not to avail himself of the opportunity, now presented to him, of enjoying the exercise of his profession in the field, but to resume the arduous, distasteful, and seemingly thankless sphere of labour, in which he had latterly been occupied." In pursuance of this determination, "he analysed the proceedings of Government, and showed, that they had begot a general belief, that the Bombay authorities either disregarded, or actually connived at, the corrupt practices of their native subordinates. He unhesitatingly told them, that their "every act"—in connection with the

Nagur prosecutions—"had tended to confirm that impression, so injurious to the British character." He implored them that—"if he had, by his former services, established any claims to their consideration"—they would "receive his appeal as he knew it deserved to be received." If there were any of his allegations, which they professed to regard as doubtful, he pledged himself to return, to resume his labours at Baroda, and there to substantiate them by unquestionable proof—and, at the same time, to establish the truth of fifteen heads or articles of statement—charges, in short, of a kind highly discreditable to the Bombay Government (p. 1377).*

That Government now took the alarm. The Charter Act, and the regulations of the Company, make it imperative for the governments of India to transmit, to the India House and the Board of Control, copies of every

* In the minutes in the Blue Books, signed "D. A. Blane,"—which evince a malignity not in manhood, and are supported, with much bad pleading from the Sudder, by Mr. Bell,—it is insinuated, that Colonel Outram's investigations of the years 1850-51, were the result of "RANCOROUS PERSONAL FEELINGS, and monomania" (pp. 913, 1285); and Mr. Reid, with his usual delicacy towards that officer,—who has willingly borne ridicule, hitherto, for his consistent effort to believe in Mr. Reid's purity, despite the evidence of his Blue Book,—now seems to reiterate the calumny (pp. 14. 30). Were any refutation requisite to the fame of an officer like Colonel Outram, it would be found more than supplied in the earlier passages of his Khutput report, and particularly those which belong to the period of these Nagur cases. Never was there known a more hollow pretext for doing wrong, than this excuse of theirs, for the removal of an officer from his post, at the very moment that he was known to be on the eve of success, in certain important investigations into official corruption;—a step by which, as the Directors themselves confess, those investigations were "arrested *in limine*" (pp. 17, 27), and, they may add, brought to nought.

"recorded" correspondence with their immediate servants. Once transmitted to England, the strong appeal of Colonel Outram could not fail to excite attention and enquiry. Hence it became a matter of great importance to prevent its being "recorded"; and,—fortunately for those who thought so,—there was still the opportunity. The letter had not been as yet received in the official routine. That routine required Colonel Outram to employ the circuitous medium of the Political Commissioner of Gujerat (Mr. Sutherland), for its transmision to the Secretariat; and this, in fact, he had done: but,—being himself on his road to Bombay,—he had also, with a view to save time, carried two copies of it thither, and had,—"semi-officially," and by way of "deliberate verbal communications" of the contents of the official document, about to come from Mr. Sutherland,—submitted one copy to Mr. Farish, the acting governor, and the other to the Secretaries of Government. "It was not long, writes Colonel Outram, with wonderful simplicity (p. 1378), ere I discovered, that my observations had made considerable impression in the quarters, where they were designed to produce that effect; *and it was equally obvious that those, who had perused my letter, felt that, in volunteering to substantiate my fifteen propositions, I had offered to do no more than I was fully competent to perform.*"

Under this persuasion—"urged by many FRIENDS in office"—and buoyed upwith the assurance, that "full justice would be done, by government and Mr. Sutherland, to the objects he had in view,"—he was induced to content the government, and to authorise the non-recording of his official letter, not yet arrived from Mr. Sutherland. "On the very day that the force was to sail,—the original not

having arrived from Baroda,"—he did accordingly leave a letter, for Mr. Sutherland, "in the hands of one of the secretaries," recalling that document, and giving his reasons for doing so (p. 1379). He sailed in the month of November, 1838.

With his departure for Affghanistan, Colonel Outram's official connection with Gujerat ceased until May 1847 (nearly seven years after the murder of Mr. Sutherland); when that model Indian servant, Sir G. Clerk, nominated him to the post of British Resident at Baroda. "I returned to Baroda," such is his mournful declaration (p. 1379), "to discover, that the doctrine of Khutput was as rife and rampant as ever, and that the officer, who should endeavour to root out corruption and vindicate the purity of British justice, must lay his account to experiencing as many obstacles as those, with which Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Malet, and myself, had to contend."

Two miscreants, named Baba Nafra and Nursoo Punt, had, two years previous to Colonel Outram's return, begun to appear upon the scene in ominous conjunction. They were both members of the Nagur caste; and they also stood related as brothers-in-law. The former was the manager of Hurree Bhugtee's bank at Baroda. The latter was a dufterdar, under the Bombay government, in the Deccan, and is said to have "gained the esteem of Mr. Reid* and

* Mr. Reid endeavours, but faintly, to deny (p. 23), that this man had ever served under him, and to lay the flattering responsibility for his character upon Mr. Williamson Ramsay and others,—not one of whom, except Mr. Goldsmid, is probably inclined to accept the load. Yet he admits that, as Dufterdar, Nursoo was subordinate to himself, the Revenue Secretary (p. 24); and that "his interest in Nursoo arose from his connection with the Revenue Department" (p. 25).

his other superiors, by his talents and business habits, during his service in their department—that of revenue. Such a man was more likely to serve the purposes of the Baroda gang, by being at Baroda, rather than by being at Ahmedabad, his native place, or at Poonah, his place of residence; and the occasion soon presented itself.

Heeralal, the head native agent, mentioned so mysteriously in Mr. Howard's minute, was dismissed by Sir George Arthur on the 21st July, 1843, for his corrupt practices. A Mahratta of good family, named Babá Fudkee, a subject and servant of the company, applied for the vacant post. He was "one of the ablest, most courageous, and useful public servants, of whom, throughout an official career of thirty years, Colonel Outram has ever had experience, and he had rendered Mr. Malet very valuable services during his struggles against the corruption prevalent in Gujerat" (p. 1381).* His application was refused. Nursoo Punt was also a candidate for the post. The fact was suspicious. His place of residence—Poonah—was the most salubrious spot in the Deccan, itself renowned for its salubrity; Baroda, the sickliest region of the sickly Gujerat. At the former place his monthly salary was 400 rupees; at the latter it would be reduced to 300 rupees. It was also notorious, that, for a long series of years, "the occupants of that post had amassed enormous wealth, by betraying the confidence of their superiors, and by engaging in and promoting the foulest corruption" (p. 1401). For what honest purpose, should he resign his post in the Deccan, in exchange

* Mr. Reid (pp. 35—37) wishes to insinuate that this character is not deserved, and that the aspersions cast upon it by his friend, Nursoo Punt, are not unmerited. In reply, I have only to refer my readers to Colonel Outram's SUPPRESSED DESPATCH (post, p. 88).

for that vacant one at Baroda?* His application, nevertheless, was granted (pp. 1400-1). The latter history of this same Nursoo Punt, says Colonel Outram (pp. 1380-1) "has left on the minds of the people of Baroda the uneradicable belief, that he enjoyed the corrupt friendship of Mr. Reid, the senior member of council." The latter history of Baba Fudkee has equally convinced them, "that honesty and zeal for the furtherance of justice are not the most effectual means of gaining the favour of government," but rather of "securing the ruin of those natives, who venture to assist British officers in the exposure of corruption." This is strong language; yet not stronger than the truth. Baba Fudkee, who had suffered too much already—if deprivation of office and aspersion of character be suffering—for his fidelity and zeal in helping the unsuccessful endeavours of Mr. Malet to stem the tide of corruption at Baroda, was henceforward a marked man. The two concluding reports of Colonel Outram on Khutput at Bombay, contain the melancholy records of his persecutions at the hands of the

* This doubt occurred to Mr. Reid himself at that time, strange to say;—and he says that he warned Nursoo, that the air of "so vile a sink of corruption as Baroda" might "contaminate himself," or at least "his reputation" (p. 24). Nursoo turned a deaf ear to the warning. With Mr. Reid and the Bombay officials he knew that his "reputation" was safe. The result did honour to his foresight. Five years later, his "reputation" was still so high,—notwithstanding his having breathed the foul air of Baroda during the whole of the intervening period,—that Mr. Reid, "feeling," as he says (p. 34), "that nothing would justify him, in placing implicit reliance on the conclusions of COLONEL OUTRAM, OR ANY ONE ELSE, in a matter of that nature," deliberately proceeded to take the measures, detailed in this narrative, for defeating Colonel Outram's attempts, to procure a fair investigation of "the transactions to which his letters related" (pp. 33-34).

Bombay government. We have neither space nor inclination to extract the details. Suffice it, that the names of Mr. Willoughby, Mr. Reid, and—we are ashamed to add—Mr. Malet himself,—for he was now the chief secretary, under that council to which his two predecessors had been promoted—figure prominently in the unworthy transactions. We use the term advisedly. Those were unworthy transactions, for which even the most inquisitorial scrutiny into the conduct of their victim, instituted by the actors themselves, has utterly failed to discover anything that may be produced in their justification. But the persecution has not been the less effectual, for being groundless and unjust. When he first accepted office under the Bombay government, he possessed "considerable private means." When Colonel Outram left India, he was "ruined;" and that officer has declared all his latter sufferings to have been "the result of services, rendered to himself as Resident" (pp. 1387, 1399-1400). His successful rival, Nursoo Punt, became, in 1844, head native agent at the residency. From that moment, the unhappy people of Gujerat—many of them being British subjects—found themselves hopelessly consigned to the mercies of the Durbar and its confederates. Under the peculiar system of government introduced by the Company, justice could only be obtained through the Resident; the Resident was in the hands of Nursoo Punt and his other subordinates—the pets of his Bombay superiors; and these subordinates were in the pay of the Durbar and its bankers. Justice was bought and sold, and corruption bid the highest. Nursoo Punt boasted openly that he had the Bombay government in his pocket; and that government silently acquiesced in the imputation. The groaning natives complained no longer.

"Immense scandal was brought on the British administration," says Colonel Outram; "and, in particular, the name of Mr. Reid came to be associated, in the public mind, with the foulest of deeds, and the vilest of men" (p. 1400). The cases of Joetabhaee Settanee, Govind Rao Guicowar, and Ghorajee Pol, may serve as examples.

The husband of Joetabhaee Settanee, one of the principal shareholders in Hurree Bhugtee's bank,—that bank in which the Guicowar also was a shareholder,—died in 1845, leaving her *enceinte*. He also left another widow, who had borne him one child. The property, which was very large, and variously stated at a million and upwards, was directed to be equally divided between the elder and the posthumous child, should the latter prove to be of the male sex. Baba Nafra, from the knowledge of the testator's business which he had acquired as the Moonim Gomashta (confidential manager) of the bank, was appointed principal trustee of the will. But, to control the actions of a man whose character was well understood at Baroda, two other persons were appointed to be his co-trustees, and even to accompany him so often as he entered the treasury of the bank,—all rich in bullion, precious stones, gold and silver vessels, and other articles of value. Another obstacle to his cupidity was soon to be presented. In three months and a half after the banker's death, his widow, Joetabhaee, gave birth to a healthy boy, and thereby dashed to the ground whatever hopes Baba Nafra might have founded, upon the chance of his having to deal with the other widow alone,—of imbecile intellect,—and her sickly infant. Moreover, on recovering from the sickness of childbirth, Joetabhaee,—a woman of superior intelligence and strong determination of purpose,—had disco-

vered certain malpractices of which Baba Nafra,—relying upon the chance alluded to, and the favour of the Guicowar and his corrupt Durbar,—had been guilty in his administration of the assets; and she had even made them the subject of remonstrance to himself and his powerful patrons. Baba Nafra, she complained, had set aside the will of her husband;—he had visited the treasury in private and unattended by his co-trustees; he was appropriating and dissipating the children's patrimony. At this critical juncture it was no longer Colonel Outram—for the period of which we are speaking is 1845-6—who represented the interests and honour of Great Britain in Gujerat. A Mr. Andrews—himself charged, by the way, with foul corruption,—was then the Acting Resident; and Nursoo Punt contrived to influence him in favour of his kinsman Baba Nafra, and to the prejudice of the widow and the orphan, —guaranteed subjects, it cannot be too often repeated, of the British Crown. This was an opportunity for the gang, and it was not neglected.

Baba Nafra, in his capacity of manager of the bank and trustee of the will, seized the younger child soon after its birth, and, under pretence of its being spurious, removed it from the custody of the mother, whom he imprisoned in an iron-barred room of her own bank. The kidnapped child was placed in the hands of some Arab vagrants; and our readers will not wonder to be told that it speedily died. In 1847, the mother was, by the personal order of Colonel Outram,—who had assumed the functions of Resident at Baroda in the month of May that year,—released, but only to become a beggar in the streets of Baroda. It was not in his power to restore her to her rights, except by way of appeal from the Guicowar; and,

knowing this, the rascally Durbar took care to delay coming to any judgment. The princely fortune of the widow and her offspring was, in the mean time, possessed by the murderers, and, as we may suppose, duly shared with their accomplices, at the residency and in the Bombay Secretariat. Difficulties, which are detailed by Colonel Outram himself (p. 319), had prevented him from doing more than making arrangements, for the due prosecution of this most atrocious case by his *locum tenens*, Captain French, on being himself obliged by sickness, in 1848, to quit Baroda. But there was nothing to prevent Captain French from availing himself of the facilities thus provided. The widow was a guaranteed British subject, petitioning for redress. Yet it was denied her. She again petitioned, but with the same result. It was afterwards discovered by Colonel Outram, or, as the Government prefer to have it, by Baba Fudkee, that the correspondence had been falsified at the residency,—that Nursoo Punt himself was implicated in the fraud,—that he had mistranslated documents,—and that he had communicated false intelligence.—(p.p. 1423-5.)

In the cases of Govind Rao Guicowar and Ghorajee Pol, enormous frauds had been perpetrated on persons enjoying the British guarantee, by Baba Nafra and other fraudulent creditors, in league with Nursoo Punt, whose influence they had secured in order to prevent Colonel Outram from arriving at the truth. His rogueries were detected, and Nursoo applied for permission to retire on his pension. Consideration for Nursoo's past services moved Colonel Outram to recommend his petition, and not to press for the penalty due to those acts of corrupt collusion, which, if pressed, would—as Colonel Outram then thought—

ensure his ignominious dismissal. He contented himself, therefore, with alluding, very mildly, to the reasons which had led him to secure the extra services of Baba Fudkee, and he expressed a hope that Government would, in punishing the criminal, treat the case as one of culpable negligence rather than of deliberate fraud. He little knew at that time the inclination of the men whom he addressed.

But the case of Baba Nafra and the bank, now become his own, demanded more energetic measures; and the forfeiture of that British guarantee, which they enjoyed merely "during good behaviour," was the only punishment which it was competent to the Government to inflict. It was likewise a measure, which had been often urged by the Court of Directors themselves upon the Government. Colonel Outram laboured hard to effect it; and he resolved to supply, in person, whatever information the Government might require, and which might be wanting in his reports on the cases of Govind Rao Guicowar and Ghorajee Pol, as well as in that of Joetabhaee Settanee. He accordingly proceeded to Bombay, and presented himself at the Secretariat, before he would consent to avail himself of his sick-leave. On quitting Baroda for this purpose, in the autumn of 1848, he had been careful to urge upon Captain French, his *locum tenens*, the necessity of a searching scrutiny into the case of Joetabhaee Settanee and her murdered child. He had already ascertained the fact, of her having received most foul usage from Baba Nafra; and he thought it not improbable, that the remainder of her case might be equally well founded. Moreover, he felt persuaded that Nursoo Punt, who had tried to deceive him, and who would, if he remained at Baroda, try to

deceive his *locum tenens*, Captain French, also, could not remain there, but would be compelled to retire, with or without a pension. He little thought that, so soon as he had sailed for Egypt, Nursoo's friend, Mr. Reid, would induce the Government to ask that criminal to recall his resignation, and that he would be left there, to deceive his *locum tenens*, as he had attempted to deceive him, and, in concert with Baba Nafra, to make sure the ruin of his victim. All this, however, as we shall see, soon came to pass.

To what extent the confederates shared the spoil, it is impossible to conjecture. It has been established, to the satisfaction of the presiding judge, and even to that of Mr. Blane, that Nursoo received on *one* occasion, £2,807 sterling "on account of the business" (pp. 1420, 1488-93). What portion went to Bombay has yet to be discovered. But it has been judicially established that, in September, 1847, Baba Nafra, with Nursoo Punt's "connivance," deputed a messenger to Bombay for the purpose of paying large bribes (p. 1012); it is also shown that much of this was designed for Mr. Reid; and the Government themselves admit (what it were idle to deny), that, in April, 1848, both Messrs. Willoughby and Reid received letters,* "intimating that it would be for their benefit to

* There is no doubt, whatever Mr. Reid may now pretend to the contrary, that these letters came from Baba Nafra (Blue Books, pp. 1412). Mr. Reid also says, that, after he had received his letter, he mentioned it in Council; and that he "afterwards destroyed it as worthless" (p. 18). That act of destruction was unfortunate! A similar letter had reached Mr. Willoughby from the same parties; "but he," says Colonel Outram (Blue Books, p. 1406) "duly recorded the insolent proceeding;" and he preserved the document (p. 1217). I regret to say, that, in Mr. Willoughby's Minute, referred to by Mr. Reid (p. 19), there is not the slightest ground for Mr. Reid's bold assertion, that Mr. Willoughby there states him "to

procure decisions, in certain cases, in favour of the firm of Hurree Bhugtee"—that is, in favour of Nulsoo Punj's relative, Baba Nafra, who had now usurped the sole management, and in whose favour, notwithstanding the insult of a bribe thus offered to Mr. Reid, all the cases were by him, in fact, soon afterwards decided. To Mr. Reid in person, at that time the senior member of council, does Colonel Outram distinctly attribute the long and scandalous delays of justice in these cases; and he has the honour too of the decisions at length arrived at.

More anxious to obtain a final decision of the cases of Ghorajee Pol, Govind Rao Guicowar, and Joetabhaee Settanee, than to take advantage of his sick furlough, Colonel Outram tarried six weeks of the autumn of 1848 at Bombay, on his way to Egypt, and urged the affair in person, but in vain. "The only answer I could get was, 'Your

---

have mentioned, in Council, the fact of his having received the note, at the time when he (Mr. Willoughby) did!" That his readers may be the better able to judge of the general veracity of Mr. Reid, I here reprint that Minute.

"No. 3.

"*Minute by the Honourable Mr. Willoughby.*

"There can be no doubt that it is highly desirable, that malpractices, of the kind alluded to by Lieutenant-Colonel Outram, should be exposed, and, if possible, punished. BUT IT IS EXCEEDINGLY DIFFICULT TO EFFECT THIS IN BOMBAY. I think the Chief Secretary should be authorised to communicate confidentially with the Advocate-General, and obtain his advice as to whether any, and, if so, what measures, can be adopted, to secure Bulwunt Rao's papers, as calculated to throw some light on the subject, and in coroboration by (*sic*) Lieutenant-Colonel Outram's surmises, that the firm of Hurree Bhugtee, OR RATHER, I SHOULD SAY, BABA NAFRA, have sent money to Bombay, under the pretext of bribing men in authority. *I circulate an anonymous note which I received, dated*

reports are still in Mr. Reid's hands."* These reports had been sent in by him on the 31st of August and 7th of September, 1849. On the 3rd of November following, the same answer was still returned. They were "still in Mr. Reid's hands." On that day, Colonel Outram, worn out with hope deferred, left Bombay for Egypt, never, so it was then expected, to return. Immediately after his departure, the widow and bereaved mother was again placed under surveillance at Baroda, and subjected to a custody and treatment, only less severe than that from which Colonel Outram had rescued her (pp. 1405-9). Government yielded to Mr. Reid's representations, contained in a Minute, the dishonesty of which has been since pronounced on by Mr. Frere in his judicial capacity,—and they solemnly absolved Nursoo Punt of all Colonel Outram's

---

the 10th April, 1848; and which, if I recollect right, I MENTIONED AT THE TIME IN COUNCIL, *and* ASCERTAINED, *that my late esteemed colleague,* MR. REID, HAD RECEIVED AN EXACTLY SIMILAR COMMUNICATION. It will be observed, that this letter, addressed to me, was enclosed under a cover, addressed to my daughter; and I think it must have been drawn up by some unprincipled and corrupt European, in league with the party at Baroda.

(Signed) "J. P. WILLOUGHBY."

"17*th July*, 1850."

* Mr. Reid now says (p. 33), that,—in thus lending his personal aid, for the despatch of the business of his own department, at a time when the state of his health required repose, and his sick furlough allowed him to seek it,—"Colonel Outram was practising A SPECIES OF THE VERY KHUTPUT, WHICH HE HAS SINCE BEEN SO EARNEST IN DENOUNCING." This is new doctrine indeed! European ears will not credit it; and, low as is the character of the Bombay service, I think that it will hardly go down at Bombay. However, it is well to have the case fairly put, as it is now put by Mr. Reid. Colonel Outram charged the villain Nursoo Punt with corruption, and it is thus that his patron retorts the charge on Colonel Outram.

charges, including even that of "culpable negligence,"—declared that "it is unnecessary to require his explanation on a single point in those transactions,"—and severely censured the absent Colonel Outram, for the slur which he had cast on the character of his native subordinate, by charges, which have been since, be it observed, judicially established to the satisfaction even of the Directors, and have at last resulted in the "miscreant's" dismissal. All the cases then pending were similiarly disposed of, that is to say, decided in strict conformity with Nursoo Punt's advice;—and corruption arose triumphant from the contest.

Eighteen months afterwards,—Colonel Outram having returned to Baroda,—every one of those decisions, indeed, was again called in question; and, at the time we are writing, the whole of them have been revised by the Court of Directors. But, in doing so, as we shall show in our next chapter, they have sacrificed Colonel Outram; and, in the eyes of the confederates of Baroda, that one significant fact is far more than an equivalent.

It is not for the Bombay Government to depreciate the conduct of Colonel Outram in these deplorable transactions. Lord Falkland, in his Minute of the 10th November, 1851, has recorded his own condemnation of the base treatment, which that gallant officer was even then on the point of receiving at his hands. "The case of Joetabhaee Settanee," writes the vacillating Lord (p. 411), "the more it is studied, must more and more impress the mind with admiration of the extraordinary ability and patience, displayed by Colonel Outram, in investigating the obscure and secret conspiracies, which are the subject of his Report, dated 30th March, 1851,—in baffling native intrigue upon its own ground,—and in unravelling with much ingenuity

(if not always successfully) the frauds, perjuries, and the mass of contradictory depositions, which have been taken and committed, from the period when Larbaee's first petition was presented to Government, in 1847, up to the date of Baba Nafra's trial and conviction, in August, 1850. He has, ALONE AND UNAIDED, stood by her; has opposed the machinations of A POWERFUL ENEMY, deriving A STRONG SUPPORT, as they must have done, FROM THEIR SUCCESS WITH THE ACTING RESIDENT, AND, THROUGH HIM, WITH THIS GOVERNMENT; has openly met the secret hostility of the Baroda Durbar; and, finally, he seems to have unveiled and exposed THE DOMESTIC TREACHERY OF THE NATIVE AGENT [Nursoo Punt], which would appear to be but TOO CLEARLY ESTABLISHED, by the facts and reasoning of this Report." It became the duty of Mr. Secretary Malet to convert this Minute into a Despatch to Colonel Outram. A copy of that Despatch would be sent to the Court of Directors; and the testimony of Lord Falkland, reluctant and tardy as it was, appeared, on re-re-perusing it, much too favorable. Contrary to every precedent of official routine, that passage from the Minute is wholly suppressed in the Despatch! (p. 435.)

In attributing to Mr. Reid the above shameful interferences with justice, Colonel Outram had the advantage of concurring with Lord Falkland, the governor, and with Mr. Secretary Malet. They admit, (pp. 985, 1082-1245) that, during the period of Mr. Reid's detention of the papers, Lord Falkland, who had previously entertained the same opinion, with Colonel Outram, of Baba Nafra's case, and "an unfavourable opinion" of Nursoo Punt himself—that formidable favorite—had suddenly changed that opinion, without allowing Colonel Outram to know that he had done

so; and that, eight weeks after Colonel Outram had gone away, to lay his bones, (so his *friends* thought,) in Egypt, he had recorded his final decision in favour of the culprit, by Minute of the 28th December, 1848. It is not denied, either by Lord Falkland, or by Mr. Malet, that the papers "were in Mr. Reid's hands," during the time specified,—that the change of opinion was produced, by the representations of that senior member of Lord Falkland's council,—and, in short, that the honour of the decision belongs exclusively to Mr. Reid himself.* That is to say,—Nursoo Punt was absolved from convicted guilt, by the man, who knew that the criminal had boasted, at Baroda, of having bought him,—whose private secretary wrote, as by his authority, to notify privately to the criminal, that such a decision was about to be made, out of his master's regard for the claims of friendship,—whose departure for England at a subsequent period, was honoured by the presence of Kêshow, the son of

* I have now to add to this body of evidence the tardy confession of Mr. Reid himself. He says (pp. 29-30), that "the minute was written on the advice which he gave," and further, that "he wrote the draft which formed the groundwork." He adds, that "there is NOT ONE LINE WHICH, on reconsideration, HE WOULD DESIRE TO ALTER." My readers will bear in mind, that the "miscreant" has since been convicted and dismissed, for bribetaking and malversation of office, in the cases, which were transmitted by Colonel Outram, and quashed by the said minute! The dispatch of the 12th January, 1849, communicating that minute to Nursoo Punt, and as usual, a mere echo of its language, informs him (Blue Books, pp.1406-14), "that all suspicion of his misconduct in respect to them is removed," and that "IT IS UNNECESSARY TO REQUIRE HIS EXPLANATION ON ANY SINGLE POINT IN THOSE TRANSACTIONS." And now, on "the 10th February, 1853," Mr. Reid, writing from London, does not wish "to alter one line of this minute!" Certainly, if Nursoo Punt has been considerate of Mr. Reid's reputation (p. 1012), Mr. Reid is not deficient on his side in gratitude towards Nursoo Punt.

the grateful culprit (p. 1485),—and whose name, five years before, had figured on the bribe-list of the Guicowar. These are unhappy coincidences, which Colonel Outram may suppose, nevertheless, to be not unsusceptible of an honorable and a satisfactory explanation. But what is like to be the opinion at Baroda?

The people of Baroda were, from the first, aware of all these circumstances. The knowledge gradually extended itself to Bombay. It is now the common scandal of India and even of Europe.

The progress of Colonel Outram's researches, and their success, had alarmed the guilty mind of his head agent, Nursoo Punt, so greatly, as to determine him to withdraw himself from the danger which threatened him, by tendering his resignation of office. It being known to the natives of Baroda, that his villanies had been already reported, by Colonel Outram, to the Bombay government, the only doubt of those amongst them, who still hesitated to believe in the efficacy of corruption, was whether the resignation would be accepted,—in which case the culprit would retire upon a pension,—or whether he would be dismissed. The decision was, therefore, looked for with interest by all, and with alarm by those, who had no hope of safety, but in the presumed probity of the Bombay government. At this juncture, they were astounded to learn, upon the authority of Nursoo Punt himself, that not only was he not going to be dismissed, but that he was to be actually invited by the Bombay government to withdraw his resignation,—that his accusers were to be disgraced,—his allies and accomplices to be taken under British protection,—and his victims abandoned to his mercy. The natives were astounded, and some of them, more enterprising than the rest, or, per-

haps, scarcely crediting the extent of their danger, endeavoured to avert it. It was resolved to address the Bombay government, and an anonymous petition was prepared accordingly—anonymous, for such is the invariable custom of India,* where the first step has to be taken against a criminal like Nursoo Punt, powerful by official station and secret or avowed alliances, and both able and willing to rid himself, by any means, of all whom he might suspect of being his accusers, or whom he might despair to suborn in his defence. It was doubly necessary to be cautious, in the case of this most formidable culprit. It was known that Colonel Outram was no longer at Baroda; and that, if he had not actually sailed, his departure for Egypt would take place immediately. The natives judged well. We have seen how great and rapid a change, in the decisions of the weak and vacillating Lord Falkland, took place, when once Mr. Reid found himself on the eve of being rid of the embarrassing presence of the importunate Colonel Outram!

Only two days† after his departure for Egypt, the Bombay government received the anonymous petition from

* Mr. Reid "is prepared to join issue," he says (p. 39), "with Colonel Outram on this subject. He has always contended that anonymous petitions ought to be treated with contempt." The question is, not what Mr. Reid "has always contended" (?), but what has always been the practice of Indian government? Moreover, he seems to forget that, in 1846, when Baba Fudkee's persecution was on the tapis, Mr. Reid himself was ready enough to send out, for immediate "investigation" then, all such anonymous petitions, as had been received against that much-injured and invaluable public servant! (Blue Books, p. 1410).

† He sailed on "the 3rd November, 1848," as he himself says (p. 1391); on "the 2nd November, 1848," as Mr. Reid asserts ("Letter, etc.," p. 37). The petition was received at Bombay, according to Colonel Outram (Blue Books, p. 1408), on the 5th November.

Baroda. "Nursoo Punt," it alleged, "now openly says, 'I have the support of Mr. Reid, the councillor . . . , As my friendship with him is of a secret nature, he will protect me from the consequences of my crime. Even Outram's father cannot injure me. What can others do then? I shall apply for a pension whenever I like. No one can read the further representations of the persons whom I have injured. Although the charge of murder was proved against Baba Nafra, I did not allow even a hair of his head to be injured. On the contrary, I have made the widow of Hurree Bhugtee to go about begging. In like manner, I will ruin the persons who have been rejoiced by the hope of my leaving. I have full means with the Guicowar government. Therefore I am not afraid of anything. I shall spend as much money as may be necessary, to secure the assistance of European gentlemen at Bombay, and shall continue to hold this situation.' These proceedings of his," continues the petitioner, "have frightened the people." He ends by imploring Mr. Reid "not to stain his character by supporting such a corrupt man" (p. 1409). But Mr. Reid had very meekly borne

---

Mr. Secretary Malet says (p. 1243), that it was received at "the Persian department" on the 25th November. In his pamphlet (pp.37-8), Mr. Reid endeavours to twist Mr. Malet's statement into an authority for his own assertion, that it only reached Bombay on that day. Unfortunately for Mr. Reid, it was judicially established, to the satisfaction of Mr. Commissioner Frere, and by him reported, without contradiction, to Government, that the document in question was in the hands of the Bombay authorities at least as early as the 20th November (Blue Books, pp. 1014, 1082). The question, however, is one of comparatively trivial consequence. Even taking Mr. Reid's audacious statement as true, the delay was great, and the concealment criminal.

the letter of advice from the corruptionists, and he put up with this new disgrace as meekly. "It is now," says Colonel Outram (p. 1408), "a matter of notoriety in this city (Baroda), that the petition was not sent to the acting Resident, to have its allegations investigated, until the day after that (the 4th of January, 1849), on which government had forwarded its invitation to Nursoo Punt, to remain at the head of the native department of my own office;—which implied that the charges I had made were quite unfounded, and thus involved a heavy censure on myself." Moreover, some twenty days after the receipt of this document, and some other twenty days before its transmission to Baroda, government had solemnly ignored a charge of forgery, well supported by proof, and which had been preferred, by the now absent Colonel Outram, against the very Baba Nafra, whom his relative, Nursoo Punt, had boasted, according to the petition, of screening from more punishment.*

* Mr. Reid is indebted to his former confederate, Mr. Secretary Malet, for the ingenious bit of quibbling by which he tries to account for these monstrous and most suspicious delays; but, for a reason which will appear presently, he takes good care not to cite his authority. He says (p. 38) that "all petitions in the native language are received, IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, in the office of the deputy secretary in the Persian department." This is not true. They are received, in the first instance, by the secretary of the department to which they belong, and are sent by him into the Persian department. It appears, in fact, that Mr. Secretary Malet himself sent the petition in question into the Persian department, on the 25th November, 1848. The petition, as printed (Blue Books, p. 951), contains just thirty-one lines of folio; and it might have been translated in as many minutes, and transmitted back to Government on the same day. Instead of that, it was kept in the Persian office until the 20th December following; and it is on this criminal detention of so important a document, at such a crisis, that Mr. Reid

But the favourable decision of the case at Bombay was already made known to the miscreants of Baroda. There is a certain Mr. J. Morris at Bombay, once the "confidential clerk of Mr. Reid,"* and afterwards transferred,—by his influence probably,—to "a high appointment in the Sudder Adawlut, of which Mr. Reid was ex-officio (as councillor) chief judge." Now, it so happened, that the very day before the notification to the Acting Resident, of "the honourable acquittal" of Nursoo Punt—punished, at last, by the way, so says a late mail, in obedience to the peremptory orders from home, contained in the despatch of the 17th Feb., 1852 (p. 18)—had reached Baroda, that miscreant was publicly parading there a letter, signed "J. R. Maurice"—written out by some native amanuensis, but evidently "at the dictation of an Englishman," and dated the 3rd Jan., 1849. "The erroneous orthography of the signa-

---

now, as Mr. Secretary Malet, in 1851, had done, rests his own justification. But he is careful to conceal a little incident, which Mr. Secretary Malet, in his usual bungling style, has blurted forth. "The gentleman who was in charge of the Persian department" during the months of November and December, 1848, was "Mr. C. Erskine" (p. 1243), Mr. REID'S OWN SON-IN-LAW!

* Mr. Reid denies the truth of Colonel Outram's statement. He says (p. 46), that "he NEVER had A CONFIDENTIAL CLERK, or PRIVATE CLERK OF ANY KIND." In Mr. Reid's position, such a fact, if true, is a veritable curiosity: more especially when it is considered that he boasts (p. 67) of not less than "two-and-thirty years of public usefulness." It is hard to imagine how he got through his useful labours at all, in such a state of isolation and bereavement. But, if Mr. Reid really knows so little of Mr. Morris's secret affairs, I should like to ask, on what authority does he venture to stand forward now as his sponsor, and, in his name, declare, that "Mr. Morris did not see the Maurrice letter before June, 1849, after he (Mr. Reid) had left India,"—that "Nursoo Punt never answered it,"—and that "no answer to it was ever sent" by any one? (pp. 59, 50).

ture," says Colonel Outram (p. 1411), "is susceptible of easy explanation. It may have been an accidental blunder of the amanuensis, who was guided by his ear, or (and this is far the more likely supposition), it may have been designedly adopted, with a view to create a loop-hole for escape, should Nursoo not keep the contents of the letter secret, and thus hereafter imperil his correspondent." The letter was as follows. It is a principal confirmation indeed of the still unanswered statements of the petition against Nursoo Punt.—

"The Hon. Mr. Reid directs me to inform you, that your petition, dated the 18th September last, has been received by government; and, after carefully reading it, etc., Mr. Reid wrote a minute strongly recommending your case to the merciful consideration of government. Accordingly an order will be issued, in a few days, to Captain French (the Acting Resident), desiring him to tell you that, as Colonel Outram is gone from Baroda (!), if you wish to continue as native agent, government will have no objection to your withdrawing your application for pension. Captain French will also be informed, that Baba Fudkee is not to be allowed to have anything to do with government business.

"Mr. Reid says, when he goes out of Council, he will recommend you to the protection of Mr. Willoughby, but that you should be very careful how you conduct yourself. You must not, on any account, allow your private feelings of enmity against Baba Nafra (!) to interfere with the business of the house of Hurree Bhugtee, at the Residency. That firm is an old firm; and, in consideration of the services, which that firm rendered in former years to the Guicowar government, the Bombay government treats

them with respect; and, though Colonel Outram strongly recommends that their bhandari (guarantee) should be cancelled, still, by the favour of Mr. Reid and Mr. Willoughby, this has not been done. Therefore you must not try, from bad feeling, to injure that firm (!)

"Keep the contents of this letter secret; and, as soon as you read it, write an answer to me, and thank Mr. Reid for his kindness to you. Address me by post, Mr. J. R. Maurrice, at Mr. Reid's house, Bombay."

The letter furnishes indeed strong intrinsic evidence of authenticity. "The revelations," says Colonel Outram, "are such that none, but a most confidential person, could have been in a position to make." The pretended quarrel, between Baba Nafra and Nursoo Punt, was not of Baroda but of Bombay invention.* It was a figment on which the Bombay government, and its European underlings laid much stress. It had served them before, as a standing pretext, for throwing discredit upon the vast body of proofs, handed in by Colonel Outram, of the corrupt understanding between those kin-

* Mr. Reid now denies, but very faintly (p. 56), that there was a simulated quarrel. He refers to the Blue Books (pp. 350, 410), for two instances in proof of the genuineness of the quarrel. In the one, Nursoo Punt, when about to be convicted, as he feared, of treachery and bribery, by Colonel Outram, endeavoured to avert the ire of his superiors, by turning round on his accomplice, and demanding the reduction—of about £477—out of a fraudulent demand of about £30,000! In the other, Nursoo Punt, at Baba Nafra's instigation, had advised the withdrawal of the British guarantee from Hurree Bhugtee's bank, at a time when that guilty miscreant, having gotten possession of the spoil, had no longer anything to hope, but everything to fear, from the longer continuance of British intervention. Mr. Reid is very welcome to make the most he can of these two notable instances!

dred miscreants. The closing paragraph points still more strongly in the same direction. If Mr. Morris were really innocent of all share in the concoction of this precious letter, it is difficult, as Colonel Outram justly remarks, to suppose that the writer would have given his correspondent the concluding direction. The similarity of the two names must have ensured the delivery of the required reply, at the house of Mr. Reid, and into the hands of Mr. Morris. That gentleman, if conscious of innocence, would have laid it immediately before Mr. Reid. Investigations would take place. And the end must have been, the detection of the clumsy and unprofitable imposture, and its complete exposure both at Baroda and at Bombay. That Nursoo himself believed in its genuineness, is evidenced by his own acts.* That the Bombay government knew it to be genuine is the natural inference to be drawn from their supineness. Nursoo had concealed it, as he was bidden, from his supe-

* Mr. Reid is high authority on every thing that relates to Nursoo Punt;—but I cannot believe, in the face of Mr. Reid's own explicit declarations, made on a former occasion, of his friendly intercourse with Nursoo at an earlier date (p. 24), that "Nursoo had NEVER IN HIS LIFE received a communication from him!" (p. 52). Neither can I believe, with the damning evidence of the official correspondence before me, that "Nursoo Punt," as Mr. Reid also states (p. 52), "was from the first perfectly satisfied that the "Maurrice" letter did not come from Mr. Reid, and that Mr. Morris was not the writer, and that he knew no more than that it was sent, either by an unknown friend or an unknown enemy." For I find that, immediately on its receipt by Nursoo, it was publicly paraded by him at Baroda, "through camp and city," in proof of his secret friendship with Mr. Reid (p. 1060). I also find it to have been judicially established to the satisfaction of Mr. Frere, that he sent a messenger with it to Muncherjee, the friend of Bala Fudkee, that he might satisfy himself, by its perusal, of the hopelessness of further resistance; and that the messenger returned with it to Nursoo (pp. 1023, 1051).

riors at the Residency, but had published it far and wide among the natives, whom it was necessary to establish in the faith of his paramount influence. The Bombay government—if we may believe their own defence of themselves—were not ignorant of the "Maurrice Letter;" nor that "both Mr. Reid and Mr. Willoughby received anonymous letters, addressed to them through the ladies of their families, requesting their support" (pp. 1082—3). Yet that government declined all investigation at the moment. For three years longer, and until compelled, by orders from home, to abandon the miscreant, they continued to heap their favours upon the head of Nursoo Punt. At length, and when Mr. Frere's remonstrances, and Colonel Outram's menaces of disclosure, forced them to make some show of anxiety, they contented themselves with an *ex parte* inquiry, before Mr Secretary Malet,—alone, or aided by a secret committee of their creatures;—and they closed the mockery by declaring, that the "Maurrice Letter" was a mystery,—that sufficient evidence had not been laid before them—and that it would answer no good purpose, at that late season, to ask for more (pp. 1013—14; 1044—9; 1260).

It was not until two years after its occurrence—Colonel Outram having returned to Baroda—that this mysterious affair came accidentally to light, in the course of other investigations. Then, for the first time, Mr. Morris recollected that he had seen, in 1849, a letter signed "J. R. Maurrice"—it must have been shown him by "Keshow" (Nursoo Punt's son)—he had intended to have followed it up, but, before he could show it to any one, he "missed it"—it was lost "for a considerable time"—then it "turned up in the pocket of an old waistcoat, which had laid a long time disused"—then

"he made it over to a Mr. Showell, and again lost sight of it for a considerable time"—then "Mr. Showell had to give it to the magistrate, in evidence (!) of a robbery that had happened in his house" (p. 1485). It is needless to pursue this ingenious defence through the whole of its improbabilities, or to show how "Keshow's examination" and "Mr. Morris's examination" contradicted and were contradicted by each other. As profitable were it to unravel the web of that familiar sanctuary of guilt—an *alibi* at Clerkenwell!

To this damning array of evidence, Colonel Outram takes occasion to add the following facts, now first made public—that the petition referred to with so much approbation in the 'Maurrice Letter,' was Nursoo Punt's petition of complaint against Colonel Outram himself, his OFFICIAL SUPERIOR—that it was not sent through the Residency—that it is now admitted to have been received at Bombay before the end of September—and that, down to the 3rd of November, when Colonel Outram took his departure for Egypt, although he was frequently importuning the government to dispose of Nursoo Punt's case, yet not only was the petition never shown to him (Colonel Outram), but its existence was never so much as hinted at (p. 1413).*

* Mr. Reid is very far from being ashamed of the illicit "circulation" of a petition, which, according to every rule of *etiquette* and common sense, ought to have been received ONLY through Colonel Outram himself, or his assistant, Mr. Battye (from both of whom it was carefully concealed by Government!). On the contrary, he draws our attention (p. 31) to these damning facts, and also to the circumstance that it was, by the authority of himself and his precious colleagues,—granted, without a word of explanation offered either to Colonel Outram or Mr. Battye, or required from them,—

If we are asked, "What interest had Mr. Reid, or had Mr. Willoughby, or any other English gentleman, in procuring a 'secret friendship' with Nursoo Punt?" we frankly say, "we know not." The matter must be left to surmise; and, for the painful surmise which must be formed of it, those gentlemen and their colleagues in the government have only themselves to blame. In the course of 1850 and 1851, Colonel Outram forwarded to Bombay depositions, establishing, *prima facie*, a most important fact. Baba Nafra had deputed his friend and agent, Joteshwur, in July, 1848, to go to Bombay, and expend some portion of the treasure, of which he had despoiled the widow and her murdered child, in buying over the officials there to forward his interests. That agent had made a full confession. He had stated, that Mr. Reid was one of the parties to be tampered with—that he had spent at Bombay 22,000 rupees (£2,200) on that occasion—and that his accounts were lodged at Bombay in the hands of a brother-in-law and accomplice. To Colonel Outram's suggestion, that the latter should be arrested, and his papers seized, the government vouchsafed to reply—that the Advocate-General was of opinion that "it could not be done, except under process." Process was what Colonel Outram had suggested. Process was not issued. In the mean time, the traitorous clerks at the Residency had informed Baba Nafra, and further inquiry and correspondence would have been fruitless (pp. 1415, 1416).

That the agent of Baba Nafra actually attempted to

---

that Nursoo Punt asked leave to withdraw his resignation, which was tendered at a time when he saw no other way to escape the punishment of his villanies.

bribe Mr. Reid on that occasion, is not stated, nor does it distinctly appear. But we have seen, that the "Maurice Letter" was written within the next six months—that Lord Falkland was, in the same interval, induced to favour the cause of Baba Nafra, as well as that of Nursoo Punt—that Mr. Reid wrote the "rough draft" of His Excellency's minute—that Colonel Outram, at an earlier period, yet still long subsequent to the date of the alleged mission, was allowed to depart for Egypt, without having been able to obtain one word of explanation with the Bombay government—and that, during all this time, "the papers were still in Mr. Reid's hands."

Money, however, to the amount of from 19,000 to 20,000 rupees, said to have been destined for the hands of Mr. Reid, is proved to have been deposited with Mr. Craig, a clerk in the Secret Department of the Secretariat, afterwards promoted to other posts, and, at the period of his detection, absent, in the Mofussil, on leave.* The books of the paymaster-general, Captain Barr, were examined by Colonel Outram, and found confirmatory of a great portion of this statement. Further depositions on oath to the same effect were obtained, and handed in by Colonel Outram to government, together with the confession of a clerk in the Bombay Pay-Office, "who had offered himself as an accomplice in the attempt to bribe Mr. Reid," and a letter from the same individual to Captain Barr, directly implicating Mr. Cole, a clerk in

* Since the publication of my Third Edition, I have received my files of Bombay papers, for January and February. From these it appears that this unhappy man died at Chandernagore, on the 15th November last; down to which date his retreat, although perfectly well-known, had not, and for very obvious reasons, been disturbed by any communication to the French authorities on the part of the Company's Government!

the accountant-general's office (an office "having no connexion with Baroda affairs"), as another accomplice in the business. Mr. Cole was willing to turn approver on promise of pardon; but the promise, recommended both by Colonel Outram and by Captain Barr, was refused by government. Mr. Craig had a brother-in-law in the Secretariat, a Mr. Smith; and the "chief secretary, on leaving Bombay, placed all the papers relating to Mr. Craig in Mr. Smith's hands." On learning this fact, Captain Barr, as well he might, "gave up the inquiry as hopeless." Colonel Outram, himself, was not "honoured with a single communication, in reference to this Craig's business" (pp. 1415, 1418). It was plain that inquiry into those matters was forbidden ground, and he had no resource but to retire from it. He did so—but not without addressing another fruitless appeal to the Court of Directors. That communication, like every preceding one, was suppressed—as long as possible—by the Bombay government. A too faithful history of their disgrace, it failed, nevertheless, to arouse their honourable masters to a just indignation against the culprits. But it ensured his own long-expected ruin—a sacrifice demanded by the vengeance, which his denunciations had provoked, and by the envy which always attends upon virtue.

"The decision of Baba Nafra's case," says Colonel Outram (p. 1406), "like all others affecting the wealthy at Baroda, coupled with the original ignoring of my charge on the part of government—with the letters received by Messrs. Reid and Willoughby—with the mission of Jotesh-wur to Bombay, with instructions from Baba Nafra to bribe Mr. Reid—with the feeble aid I had received in my proceedings against Baba Nafra—with the fact that, though

government had not interposed in behalf of Joetabhace, they desired me to see that no undue severity was practised on Baba Nafra, till government had confirmed the sentence passed on him by the Guicowar—and with the fact that, while the one case affected the firm, the other was wholly personal to the Baba himself—coupled with these and numerous other facts, adverted to in this report,—the decision of government, I am satisfied, cannot have failed to make an unfavourable impression at Baroda."

For the guilt of these highly disgraceful transactions was not confined to the actors. It redounded to the Bombay government in at least an equal degree. It consisted not only in the real impunity accorded to the chief culprits, but in the zeal professed for the punishment of a few luckless and discovered subordinates. Mr. Malet, unable to deny, admits, with official candour, the detected villany of Mr. Craig, and even contrives to turn the occasion to advantage. If we may believe his memorandum (p. 1084), Mr. Craig was not only guilty, but the only guilty man in the whole affair—an "incestuous" man—and a hypocrite. He might have added (for that would have been true, and to the purpose), that the unhappy man was unable any longer to answer for himself. At the date of the memorandum, he was a fugitive from Bombay; although none of his confederates have hitherto followed his example. His brother-in-law, Mr. Smith, is just such another sacrifice to Nemesis. His crime consisted in his knowledge of Craig's guilt—in his not revealing it—and in his being found out. A wretched clerk or two have also fallen victims to the same necessity. The patrons and protectors of the murderer Baba Nafra, of "all the wealthy at Baroda" (p. 1406), of their accomplice, Nursoo Punt, and of the whole base tribe of bribers, perjurers,

and poisoners, from Sarabhoy the Nagur, down to their present pet, Bhow Tambekur, the Guicowar's infamous minister,—may nevertheless point to such vicarious sacrifices as these, in proof of their zeal for justice, and their hatred of corruption. Sir James Weir Hogg and the Directors "have come to the conclusion, with regard to Mr. Cole, that the presents which he received, as fees for service, in connexion with legal proceedings, and *in the character of a confidential clerk to Mr. Howard* [who was then as now the Company's Remembrancer,—who had been the Acting Advocate-General during the Dhackjee Dadajee investigation,—and who is soon to succeed the public-spirited Mr. Le Mesurier, as permanent occupant of that office,]. and for petitions, etc., drawn out by him, Mr. Cole, *corrected by Mr. Howard*, and sent in to government by the nephew of Baba Nafra,"—of themselves constitute a sufficient reason, why that unhappy clerk "ought not to remain in the service of government" (p. 20). The same Chairman and the same Directors have not "come to any such conclusion," with reference to Mr. Howard himself, Cole's master. Cole is dismissed with disgrace—Howard is retained with honour. Yet, independently of the evidence afforded in the above passage, which is cited from a Despatch of the Court, dated the 3rd April, 1852, Colonel Outram had told the same Court, in 1851, that it was well known, in his time, that this same Mr. Howard, even then in the service of government, and one of its legal advisers, "was, nevertheless, retained, under large fees, to conduct appeals on Baba Nafra's behalf"; and that "the circumstances, under which the money was given, and the sources from which it was derived," were such, as to make it probable that it would become "the subject of a reference to the Honourable Court" (p. 1434).

But the "Honourable" Court has anticipated the threatened reference, and, in doing so, has shown how it means to deal with it when it comes. The character of the Secretariat being certainly at the lowest, the examples necessary to reformation must be sought in the higher circles. A thousand sacrifices of Coles and Craigs and Evanses will do no good. Pecuniary embarrassment is the fruit of extravagance, and the mother of corruption. "The Secretariat," exclaimed, from the Bench, the present Chief Justice of Bombay, "appear bent upon running a race through the Insolvent Court—and capital fun, no doubt, they find it!"

CHAPTER IV.

How Indian Officials punish Honest Men, for Exposing the Bribery of their Servants.

Colonel Outram's representations had waxed indignant, in proportion to the neglect shown him. His government had been as little moved by his indignation as by the obloquy which occasioned it; for, where fortune and station are independent of character and credit, the loss of fair fame to those who deserve the loss, is a thing of little moment. Theirs is the coolness of indifference; or, like *Maw-worm*, "they loves to be despised." But the researches of Colonel Outram continued, and their success became more frequent; and the Durbar of the Guicowar began to be really alarmed for the consequences. The dismissal of that officer presented itself to his enemies as a measure of self-preservation. A pretext was wanted;—and they found it in the systematic disrespect evinced for authority, in his fifteen years' proceedings and correspondence.

The Court of Directors, whose whole policy consists in averting, by the basest concessions, if need be, the attention of a British public from Indian affairs, have—naturally enough—sustained the Bombay government and confirmed the removal of Colonel Outram. But the pretext, on which that government proceeded, is too much even for the Court of Directors, and their chairman, Sir James Weir Hogg. They are constrained to tell "our governor in council at Bombay," in reply to the minutes of that body, dated the 28th February last,—that the honourable

court "do not perceive, in the papers transmitted, any instance of Lieut.-Colonel Outram's having persisted in proceedings, which he had been instructed by government to discontinue" (pp. 26-7). The policy of that government,—never friendly to measures necessary for the maintenance of its honour,—was the real motive of the step; and the pretext is too transparent to conceal it.

Specific charges of a damning and most scandalous character, and to all appearance strongly flanked with evidence to support them, have for years been levelled against members of the government of Bombay by name, with reference to this very matter. But, although the most respectable newspapers at Bombay are the organs of the accusation, neither the government nor the parties immediately concerned, have hitherto taken any step towards their vindication. It was boldly asserted, for instance, with reference to the acquittal of Nursoo Punt, that, in the Revenue Secretary, an intimate friend of Mr. Reid, that culprit possessed a powerful patron, obliged to his cause by the strong bond of gratitude; and it was hinted that the official personage in question, had at a critical period of his former life, been indebted, for his own escape from a charge of murder, to the evidence adduced by the same Nursoo Punt! Yet even this scandalous insinuation failed to arouse the government, or their servant, from slumber, or to urge them to the defence of their honour: and,—although more than a twelvemonth has elapsed,—the journals in which it appeared have not been called upon to make good the accusation.*

* Mr. Reid is even more obtuse, and, with the two former editions of my pamphlet before him, actually goes so far as to vouch the Revenue Secretary to warranty, for "the high and honourable character" of his friend Nursoo Punt (p. 23)!

Even the corrupt Durbar of the Guicowar is more honorably sensitive. The disclosures published in the Bombay press were, "in his highness's opinion, calculated to degrade his government;" and he made his complaint to that of Bombay. "But you," say the Court of Directors, addressing the latter, "very properly intimated to the Guicowar, that the British (?) government never take notice of paragraphs in the newspapers, commenting on its own conduct, and that it (?) recommends to his highness a similar conduct." The Guicowar, forced to accede to their recommendation, found himself condemned to submit to the degradation, with a supineness, of which our own Queen's government was falsely represented as setting the example (pp. 10-15). It is little less than ridiculous for such men, to complain of almost any amount of disrespect, confidentially administered by one in Colonel Outram's position. But the pretext was an after-thought; and as such it seems to have been viewed even by the conniving Court of Directors. To those who have studied the papers, it is quite clear that, if Colonel Outram had, as it was expected he would have done years ago, quitted his post at Baroda in sheer weariness and disgust, the world would have heard not a syllable of the strength of his language, nor of the delicacy of honour which compelled his masters to resent it.

Wearied and disgusted he must have been with the treatment which he received, and those who aided him. Wearied and disgusted, above all, with the sense of that treatment, as contrasted with the favour invariably shown to the dishonest. Every safe expedient—and not a few of another kind—were resorted to in the hope of breaking him down. All his representations were questioned and unheeded—all

his complaints refused. His witnesses were oppressed and ruined. The accused—we might almost say the convicted—were everywhere flattered, caressed, and preferred. His own investigations were discountenanced and made fruitless—in many cases actually forbidden. If, by a rare chance, his importunity prevailed so far as to obtain the institution of inquiry into the truth of his charges, the usefulness of the concession was marred by restrictions imposed at the outset. Either the case was prejudged in the eyes of the natives by the display of military honours, rendered to the accused—or the inquiry was private, irregular, and productive only of insult to the accuser, without the possibility of reaching the culprit,—or else some corrupt servant was the person selected to conduct the inquiry,—or if some honest gentleman was sent, he was notoriously a private enemy to Outram—and his discretion was hampered by a direction to conform himself to the rules of practice and evidence obtaining at Westminster, which it was idle to expect a mere layman, ignorant of law as the Company's magistrates avowedly are, to understand; —or Colonel Outram was ordered to take upon himself the office of prosecutor, for which he strenuously pronounced himself to be by education and habit unfit, and, thereby—for the absurd "Regulation of 1850," does so enact—to disqualify himself as witness—the office peculiarly his own —and this, be it observed, in a case where, from the very nature of things, he was notoriously the sole, or at least the principal witness. If, in spite of all drawbacks, and against all expectations, the commission reported that the charges were proved, and that punishment ought to follow, the decision was sure to be evaded at head-quarters. To colour an injustice, it is always possible for chicanery

to discover, in the writings of unpractised men, some vagueness or inaccuracy of language, however trifling, on which to hang a quibble; and the error, the omission, or the excess of a letter, or of a figure, in an indictment at the Old Bailey, has been frequently made use of in arrest of judgment, and to cheat the gallows of its due (pp. 26—7. 34—232, 934—1039).

In making serviceable such points of special pleading to the cause of a culprit like Nursoo Punt, Mr. Bell, the "judicial member of the Council," appears to have been particularly distinguished. It is in his minutes above all, that the "misdescription" is pointed out, the "variance" urged, the "flaw" detected. When these fail, he knows of "pleas" in store, or at least "evidence in mitigation of punishment," to make available. Pity for a criminal, whose crime was corruption, would seem to have possessed his breast, to the exclusion of every other consideration. He had no such tenderness for Colonel Outram a few months later, when the dismissal of that officer came in question. Neither Mr. Bell nor Mr. Blane then displayed, in favour of that meritorious and deeply injured gentleman, a particle of the anxiety, which, in the case of Nursoo Punt, had led them to use their best endeavours to obtain, for that convicted miscreant, the sentence of "removal" upon a pension, instead of the "dismissal" due to the offence.* The inconsistency of such conduct, and the disregard of public opinion which it evinces, are in Mr. Bell the more blameable, because he

* The audacity of one of Mr. Bell's Minutes in favour of this expedient deserves special mention. Had the Government, writes Mr. Bell, not advised Nursoo to the contrary, he would have taken that course "two years ago," on Colonel Outram's preferring against him the very charges on which he was now at last most unhappily

could not have forgotten, that it behoved him at least to be circumspect, in a country where the suspicion of corruption is easily excited, because justified by too many examples. Mr. Bell himself, before his elevation to the Council, had been arraigned on charges of corruption, and the Court, which acquitted him, had attributed the charge to a "conspiracy," just as he himself has done with the charges against Nursoo Punt.*

But the spirit of Colonel Outram was unbroken, and

convicted! Under these circumstances, he thinks, removal on a pension is quite sufficient "to mark the sense Government must entertain of the position, in which Nursoo has SUFFERED HIMSELF TO BE PLACED!" (Blue Books, p. 1027).

* It is gratifying to be able to turn, from these sickening and revolting details, to the bright, but alas! too rare example of a public servant like Mr. Frere. He did his duty nobly; and if, having resembled Colonel Outram in his good desert, he shall hereafter obtain the like reward from his *grateful* masters, I confess it will not surprise me. I have already stated the result of his long and harassing investigations into the charges against Nursoo Punt. It is not only in the conduct of those enquiries, that he offers a remarkable contrast to the behaviour of his government, which he served best by refusing to render the services they anticipated to their *protégé*, the culprit who stood before him. His whole demeanour, from the beginning to the end of the correspondence, was of a piece throughout. In nothing was it more admirable, that is to say, more strongly contrasted with that of Nursoo Punt's own patrons, than in the course he took to dissever himself, in the public eye, from the contamination of that intercourse which Nursoo wished to have it believed existed between them. *He* did not, like Mr. Reid, tamely submit in silence to the degrading imputation. When Nursoo, in support of it, took the usual step, of directing all his letters to be sent to Mr. Frere's care, during the enquiry, Mr Frere, in open court, "read Nursoo a severe and indignant lecture on his impertinence," and, throwing at his feet the letters so received, imposed his commands on the culprit not again to offend in like manner (Blue Books, p. 1444). Mr. Reid would have us suppose

his determination fixed, to remain where his duty was, and to adhere to that duty, through evil and through good report. His enemies sighed for his departure from Baroda. Yet to accomplish that, nothing short of his dismissal from office was adequate; and his reputation was believed to be too formidable, and his friends too powerful, to make that an easy measure. Accident or design, however, at length gave the opportunity.

In the course of the year 1850, the government had the same question pressed upon them from other and unexpected quarters. In the Southern Mahratta country, Mr. Hart, the Enam commissioner—in Ahmedabad, Mr. Bettington, the judge,—found the belief in Khutput so universal, as to justify them in official complaints of the apathy of government, in the vindication of the public honour and the character of courts of justice. Mr. Willoughby, according to the *Bombay Gazette* (21st Sept., 1852) advised Lord Falkland to disregard these communications, as he had disregarded those of Colonel Outram. But he was now

---

that Mr. Williamson Ramsay—one of the ablest and most honourable of public servants, and to whom the very name of Nursoo Punt is an abomination—participates with himself in the disgrace of being one of Nursoo's correspondents. If that gentleman were in England—and Mr. Reid knows full well that he is now far away, and quite out of the reach of his pamphlet!—he would answer for himself in this particular. In the meantime, I may remind Mr. Reid, that to receive from Nursoo Punt a letter is a mortification which may happen to any man, and to be desired to forward it to Mr. Reid is just such another (Letter, etc., p.41);—but that the question is, how did Mr. Williamson Ramsay deport himself under the infliction? Was Mr. Reid, or was Mr. Frere his model? No one can doubt how Mr. Williamson Ramsay himself, when he is made acquainted with the artful way, in which his name has been abused in this respect, will answer that question.

out of favour; and his counsels were no longer followed by the once confiding viscount.

By the advice, it is said, of Mr. Willoughby's enemies at Bombay, that government, in the month of May, 1850, issued its famous Khutput circular. It was addressed to the Political, Judicial, and Revenue Departments, under its respective dates of the 15th, the 23rd, and the 28th May, 1850. It is generally believed to have been the original intention of the framers, that the circular was to be addressed to the Judicial Department alone,—the obnoxious Mr. Willoughby being *ex officio* judge of the Sudder; and it is believed, that the transmission of the same circular to the two other departments was the error of a subordinate. *Felix culpa!* if that be so. It has been the means of procuring, through Colonel Outram, a servant in the "political" department, that complete exposure of governmental corruption which forms the subject of these remarks. It is useful to observe, also, that although more than two years and a half have elapsed, Colonel Outram's report is still the only return as yet made to the circular letter, so far as Parliament knows; for it is the only one that has been laid before Parliament, in obedience to its order of last year. Yet the world at large,—at least the Indian world,—know full well that the reports of the Revenue and Judicial officers, were received at Bombay twelve months before Colonel Outram's report. Still, if we are to believe the return made by the Court of Directors to Parliament, and their dispatch of the 26th June, 1852, not one of those reports had reached the India House down to that date—that is to say, more than eighteen months after they had been received at Bombay;—and that the honourable Court had not been more favoured than Parliament itself, with "the

other replies, on the same subject, which the said circular letter had elicited" (p. 26.)

If Lord Falkland really meant fair and searching inquiry, his subsequent conduct is inexplicable. If he meant no such thing, he had better have taken Mr. Willoughby's advice, and continued deaf to the indignant advocates of the honour and character of his government. There was no mean path between his past policy, and that to which Colonel Outram had in vain invited him. There was no halting place for him between wrong and right. But this truth his recent exasperation against his former confederate, Mr. Willoughby (provoked by a quarrel of classes between that gentleman and Colonel Melvill, a military favourite of the governor,—and withal brother to that important personage, Mr. J. C. Melvill, secretary to the Court of Directors), combined with his lordship's still unallayed dislike to Colonel Outram, prevented him from seeing. It is also reasonable to suppose, that, misled as he had hitherto been by Mr. Reid and his other advisers, Lord Falkland was, in fact, ignorant of the full extent of corruption, and therefore incapable of foreseeing the storm he was about to conjure forth. Mr. Reid had left India. Mr. Willoughby's advice was unsavoury. Mr. Blane was too deficient in manly vigour to be qualified for any functions but those of his Lordship's most obsequious follower, and the jealous guardian of counsels, in the inspiration of which, pregnant with mischief, as they were, his nature was unfitted to take part. His present colleague, Mr. Bell, whose own experience of charges of Sudder corruption would have certainly led him to warn Lord Falkland of the consequences of the contemplated inquiry, was not as yet a member of council, but only a Sudder judge. These

were, indeed, untoward circumstances, to occur at so critical a moment. The "Khutput Circular Letter" was the consequence.

"Government"—such is the language of that document—"has been led to believe, that an impression prevails in some parts of the Mofussil, that, by means of intrigues at the Presidency, the arrangements of local officers can often be defeated or superseded, by the parties interested secretly obtaining the friendship of persons in power, who, it is expected, will, irrespective of right and wrong, interest themselves for the party soliciting their favour; and that, by these means, objects are attainable which, if left to be sifted and reported on, in a deliberate and regular manner, could never be secured. This species of intriguing is termed, in the Mahratta and Canarese districts, 'making Khutput in Bombay;' and is stated to be regarded as a remedy under difficulties of whatever kind. It is even held to be considered as effectual, in obtaining the restoration to place of official servants who, for incapacity or dishonesty, have been discharged from government-service, and to be even capable of effecting the release from gaol of a convicted felon. A belief in the existence of a system of this nature is calculated greatly to embarrass the officers of government, and to undermine the confidence of the Ryots (!) in the justice of the system by which they are governed. I am accordingly directed to request, that you will have the goodness to report, after making any inquiries you may deem requisite, whether you have reasons for supposing, that any such belief prevails generally, or amongst any particular class of persons, within the limits of your charge; and, if so, that you will offer any suggestions that may occur to you, as to the best means of eradicating the same."

We know not what effect this remarkable appeal produced in other quarters; for, as we have said, the information is withheld from the public; but on Colonel Outram the effect was salutary and instantaneous. Taking pen in hand, and Lord Falkland at his word, he sat down and commenced his Khutput Report, in three parts; of which the first two were finished and transmitted on the 31st October, 1851, and the third on the 13th of January, 1852. The document occupies 144 printed folio pages, of the parliamentary papers, and embraces the events of nearly seventeen years, in the scandalous history of the Presidency. It is indeed an awful recapitulation—a sort of Doomsday catalogue of crimes unexpiated; and the annoyance, which the recital must have occasioned to the Bombay government, is to be measured by the number and gravity of the offences, and the intensity of the desire to forget them. Yet no man can with truth accuse Colonel Outram of officiousness in the matter. He had received the instructions of the Bombay government; he had obeyed them; he had not exceeded them either in letter or in spirit. He *did* "make any inquiries he deemed requisite;" he *did* "report his reasons for supposing, that the belief in Khutput prevailed generally, within the limits of his charge;" and he *did* "offer any suggestions that occurred to him, as to the best means of eradicating the same."

He had been censured—in times past—by those very men, for his inability to procure precise and clear indications or evidence of the existence of Khutput. A series of lucky chances, improved by his own indomitable perseverance, had placed in his hands the means of supplying the alleged deficit. He did supply it; and to an extent which startled

—and perhaps alarmed—his superiors. The longer his dismissal was deferred, the more difficult would it be to repair the consequences of the error, into which a false security had lulled the enemy. His *matter* was no longer impeachable for its paucity—far from that—there was a great deal too much of it. The pretext was to be sought in the *manner* of his proceedings. Not that there was anything in the pretext—even the Court of Directors, as we have seen, confess that. Nobody, the Bombay government perhaps excepted, can deny, that, in reporting his reasons and suggestions, he was most fastidiously careful in his choice of language. He had to denounce much scoundrelism and villany, and, in dealing with these he employed the mildest epithets which the subject allowed. He was even scrupulous, on all occasions, to distinguish between the highest officers and their subordinates. To Mr. Willoughby, and even to Mr. Reid, he was studious to allow the benefit of that good character, which he thinks to be inseparable from the offices of judge, of secretary, and of member of council, under the Company's government! And, when our readers are informed, that he labours hard to convince himself and all about him, that proofs and arguments ought to sink before the presumption of innocence, afforded by the possession of high office, and that subordinates alone are capable of corruption, they must admit that the zeal of the reformer had nothing in it, which his government ought to have accounted as personally offensive or hostile. But his government professed to think far otherwise.

On the 22nd November, 1851, Lord Falkland in council determined, that the language, in which Colonel Outram had expressed himself, made his removal necessary, even

before his lordship and his colleagues could take the report itself into consideration at all. With a singular inconsistency, however, Mr. Blane, one of the council, in subscribing to the governor's minute, added on his own part a shrill official condemnation of "the Quixotic design, of eradicating the popular belief in the efficacy of indirect influence, through the corruptibility of government officials!" Of two things one. Either the Khutput report had, at that time, been considered in council, although Lord Falkland's minute states the contrary; or this censure on Colonel Outram, for his endeavour to comply with the very terms of the circular letter under which he acted, was impertinent, officious, and premature (pp. 1283-5). The same member of council, in a subsequent minute, approved of by his colleague, Mr. Bell, and not dissented from by Lord Falkland, more expressly states, that "he considers his removal to have been forced upon us (the council), by his persisting in proceedings, dictated by the sentiments evinced in the letter attached to his Khutput report, and not solely by the inditing of that letter" (pp. 1322-3). It is clear, therefore, that the removal of Colonel Outram *was* designed to mark the sense entertained, of his report, by the very men, whose connivance in the guilty practices denounced in that report, ought to have ensured their own removal from a post of which they had proved themselves unworthy.

There is something suspicious, too, in the haste with which they proceeded. On the 1st December, 1851, Colonel Outram received his dismissal (p. 1480). In the meantime, there appeared, in a Bombay newspaper, an anonymous and erroneous paragraph, to the effect that he intended to leave Baroda on the 23rd. "Upon the day

subsequent to this publication," he says (p. 1481), "Mr. Malet was directed to request that, if I had not already left Baroda, I would, by return of post, state the day of my departure; which the Governor in council thought should be no longer delayed." Were these people afraid, lest the enquiries, in which, down to his dismissal, he was actively engaged, should result in new discoveries?

The Court of Directors have confirmed the removal of Colonel Outram. But it is worthy of notice, that, in signifying a kind of censure of the language of his report, as deficient in "respect," towards men who knew not, or cared not, how to respect themselves, and in declining to set before the Indian people the only proof of their own innocence of all share in the corruptions of Baroda that could be satisfactory, namely, the honourable and instant restoration of Colonel Outram to his office at that capital—the Court of Directors, with, a calmness truly astonishing, take care to add,—"We shall not now enter into ANY examination of the SUBSTANCE of that report!" (pp. 26-7). We are glad to know that the Court of Directors were not unanimous, in a decision so arrived at. Colonel Sykes and a few more protested; and their protest, directly condemning the Bombay government, and demanding Colonel Outram's restoration, is one of the unproduced records of the India House, which have been asked for by Mr. Otway, the Member for Stafford—which are withheld by the Court of Directors—and which ought to be demanded by Parliament.

Great were the rejoicings—amongst the knaves at Baroda—when the news of Colonel Outram's removal reached them. As usual, they had the first of it. The "confidential" members, or servants, of the Bombay govern-

ment always took care that the earliest intelligence of the "secret and reserved" resolutions, of "our Governor in Council" should be forwarded to the *protegés*, whom they most concerned; before they reached the Resident, whose office it was to carry them into execution. A very flagrant case of the kind, by the way, was in course of detection at the Residency, when, most providentially, the proceedings were stopped by the dismissal of the Resident. At the Baroda post-office, Colonel Outram had intercepted a paper, containing the Gujerattee translation of a body of "detailed accounts of deliberations," and "secret and reserved" minutes, agreed to in Council at Bombay only the night before the departure of the Baroda mail, and not yet put in execution, much less published, at the seat of government. This document, with a large body of supplemental proofs, he transmitted to Bombay, in the vain hope that they would arouse the government to action. The hope was vain. An insignificant and uncovenanted lad, named Marston, not proved to have had even the means of access to the secret department, from which the document had been extracted, was dismissed upon suspicion. The youth objected to be crushed,—began to publish,—and made important revelations of the disgraceful state of the archives in the secret department, and of the manner in which the confidence reposed in public servants was betrayed. He went further. He threatened proceedings against Mr. Secretary Malet for libel. The purpose was suddenly dropped. The needy Marston rose quickly into comfort, perhaps into affluence. He is now driving a good trade at Bombay, as agent of Indian grievances.

Colonel Outram having left Baroda, the dismissal of the boy Marston closed the controversy; and so that matter

ends, to the general disgust of all, but the parties implicated. Even the Court of Directors are dissatisfied; and, in their political letter of the 23rd June last (written, be it observed, after the affair had been stirred by Mr. Anstey in the Commons), they say so frankly;—adding, however, with much absurdity, "We trust that the investigation has been continued, and that nothing on your (Lord Falkland's) part will be omitted to make it effectual" (pp. 16—17, 1449—67).

Greater still were the rejoicings—amongst the knaves of Baroda—over the providential occurrence of the long expected dismissal of Colonel Outram at so critical a moment. Baba Nafra, the murderer of the orphan,—Bhow Tambekur, the prime minister,—and his adept, Rowjee Bhaskur,—the confidant of the conspiracy of his chiefs to assassinate Colonel Outram, as they had assassinated his not less honest predecessor, Mr. Sutherland,—vied in their demonstrations of gratitude to gods—perhaps to men. Whether or not upon this occasion, as upon former occasions, bags of Baba Nafra's money were distributed under cloud of night in certain gardens of Bombay, we will not pretend to conjecture. But to the shrine of Shree Nursinjee at Baroda, a palankeen of honour, valued at 3,500 rupees, was offered, together with a village yielding 600 rupees yearly,—in token of the Guicowar's thanksgiving for "his minister's victory over Outram, as expected according to the news received from Bombay!" For a moment their joy was damped. It was told to them, that Colonel Outram was on his way to London, seeking justice, and that the friends of justice were powerful at the India House. But their apprehensions were speedily calmed. The Gujerattee newspapers of the 29th

August last inform us, that the iniquitous and incoherent decision of the court of directors had reached Baroda, and was handled there as a new proof of the efficacy of corruption. "Bhow Tambekur now gives out in the public Cutcherry (court), that Colonel Outram has lost all consideration in London,—that he (Bhow Tambekur) has some influential friends, who have rendered him assistance—and, therefore, that Colonel Outram would not obtain redress there." It is, perhaps, improbable, yet surely very possible, that Bhow Tambekur has spoken the truth here. He has also boasted, and this time certainly with reason, that "those persons, who have disregarded him, and rendered their assistance to Colonel Outram, have been taught a lesson, and that he (Bhow Tambekur) will teach the others."

They have had a lesson, indeed. By a late arrival we are informed that "every native at Baroda, who helped the Resident in his investigations, is now allowed by the local government to stand the brunt of the Guicowar's persecutions—and suffering greatly for having trusted to the honour of the British government. Govind Rao Roria," the late Baroda Vakeel at Bombay, who proved the handwriting of Bhow Tambekur to a treasonable document contained in Colonel Outram's report (pp. 1457—66), "is now a close prisoner in his own house, suffering every indignity most insulting to a high-born native—and weekly undergoing torture by order of his Highness. Baba Fudkee," the high-minded Mahratta gentleman, of whom we have said so much, "is now a refugee in Bombay, and has saved his life, at the expense of all his property in Baroda, seized by the agents of the Guicowar. The widow, Jaetabee Settanee," a guaranteed British subject, and the

mother of the child murdered by Baba Nafra, "is still a pensioner, in the house of which she ought to be joint mistress, and dependent, for her mere food and clothes, upon the elder widow of her late husband." Baba Nafra, the murderer—who was sentenced, for his crime, by the conniving judges of the Guicowar, to the "signal punishment," as Sir James Weir Hogg was not ashamed to call it, of seven years' imprisonment,—is again and again represented in the parliamentary papers, not only by Colonel Outram, but by the Government, as undergoing even that punishment only in name (pp. 9, 867, 905-6). Later intelligence is to the same effect. He is housed "in a comfortable and commodious set of rooms, his family allowed to visit him, whenever it may suit him; and, at the directions of the Guicowar, a set of chains are kept by the prisoner, and are only put on, when any visitor, who might tell tales wishes to see the Baba." The mother of his murdered victim is starving. The plunder is still in his keeping; nor does it appear to be the official intention that he shall be made to disgorge it. It is even stated, that the unhappy woman has been recently influenced by Mr. Davies, the officer who was appointed to succeed Colonel Outram at Baroda, to compromise the business.

The Bombay government have at last found, in Mr. Davies, a Resident to their mind. We quote from the letter of a native inhabitant of that city, received at Bombay, by the Editor of the *Telegraph*, in the month of December last:—

"On the evening of the 24th ultimo, Bhow Tambekur, the Guicowar's minister, set out from the city to visit the Resident. *He was received by Mr. Davies, with that honour and respect which is due only to the Raja.* British regi-

ments were stationed on both sides of the road, through which the procession passed, in the same way that I read of the new Commander-in-Chief being received at Bombay, when he arrived from England. The Bhow certainly appears to have been well rewarded, for the manner in which he has betrayed the interests of the British Government, during the last three years, and for the way in which he has shared in the plunder, which was taken out of the coffers of Hurree Bhugtee's house. The people here all declare, that, at the present day, to be honest, or to help in the detection of villany, is not the way to gain favour of the English authorities. Our past history does not supply us with a single instance, where the Minister of an inferior state was paid the compliments, due to his master, by the representative of a superior power. The public voice here is not much heard; and, were it not for your paper, would not be heard at all by the great men at the Presidency. Through your columns, I tell the Governor of Bombay and his Council, that their representative here has done a most foolish thing, and that, sooner or later, they will repent of what they have done. Some people think, that the Government have sent orders to Mr. Davies to pay this honour to Tambekur; but I cannot believe it. If Colonel Outram's Khutput Report is ever published *entire*, I think you and others will acknowledge, that, so far from Bhow Tambekur receiving any honour from the representative of the British Government, the Guicowar ought to be made to dismiss him from his employment. If the Resident has disgraced the British name in this manner at his own risk, the Bombay Government should take notice of it. The boast of the Baroda Durbar now is—what it was about a year ago,—that

"gold can effect any thing with the English Sirkar" (government). The people here believe this, and say, "if gold did not get the Bhow in favour, how was it accomplished?" One of the articles of the Baroda treaty is, that no prime minister be appointed by the Guicowar, unless the nomination is sanctioned by the British Government. But the appointment of the Bhow has never been sanctioned by the Bombay Government, although the said Minister exercises all the functions belonging to that high office. His holding the office at all is a gross abuse of power; and his nomination was effected when Colonel Outram was in Egypt, and Captain French was acting as Resident—I need not say that it was effected entirely through the influence, and at the instigation, of Nursoo Punt.

"All classes of the community are in the greatest distress, at witnessing this triumph of Bhow Tambekur; and all say, that, when oppressed by the officers of the Guicowar, it will now be utterly useless for them to appeal to the British Government; as the latter has now shown that it is most friendly, and pays the very highest compliment, to the greatest tyrant that ever was known—even at this most corrupt court.

"The Guicowar is, as you know, a mere puppet in the hands of the Bhow. As soon as the latter told his master of the triumph he had partaken of, at the Resident's camp, his Highness ordered that the same respect should be paid him, by the Baroda troops, every day the Bhow went abroad. In the event of failure, severe punishment is to be awarded to those who neglect this order.

"The state of affairs in Baroda now is as bad as it can be. The old *Shiladars*, the faithful servants of the late

Guicowar, are many of them in confinement, whilst others are suspended from their functions by Tambekur. If you doubt the truth of my statements, I could produce numerous instances, as evidence of what I state. One Goad Goster, a follower of the late Guicowar, and a man of good family, has been suspended from his office, because he incurred the displeasure of Tambekur; and Bhaskur Rao Wittul will most likely be the next victim; for he is at present prevented from going to the Durbar by order of the Bhow. You have often mentioned in your paper, the case of poor Govind Rao (*supra*, p. 78), late Vakeel from the Baroda court to Bombay. It was an evil day for that poor man, when he left the Presidency, to come here. He is now a prisoner in the hands of the Bhow, and will—unless the English government interfere—most assuredly be murdered by the minister.

"The Guicowar himself is entirely given up to drunkenness, and every species of filthy debauchery. The real ruler of the state is the Bhow. People here have a saying that 'the Baroda Durbar shines so much with gold, that every British Resident, who ever came here, is dazzled by it, with the single exception of the good Colonel.' It is certain that, in the Colonel's time, redress for our wrongs *was* to be obtained; and it is equally certain, that such is *not the case now*.

"Sacrifices of goats and sheep are still carried on, at the order of the Guicowar, in order to effect the death of Outram in England. But we look upon the Colonel as a man favoured by God, and therefore one that will not be hurt by the evil influence of those who attempt to injure him.*

* Colonel Outram is now in England, and will probably laugh at all such incantations. But, if he were in Baroda, he would not despise

"If the Bombay government wish the affairs of Baroda to prosper, they should, without any delay, commence a strict investigation into all the matters I have mentioned,—and more particularly into the fact, that ONE OF THE MOST UNJUST AND CRUEL TYRANTS EVER KNOWN AT ANY EASTERN COURT, IS RECEIVED BY THE BRITISH RESIDENT WITH ROYAL HONOURS."

The character of our service, under these heavy inflictions, may be easily imagined. We can neither conceal the disgrace nor deny it. In the atrocities we have detailed, the highest names are implicated, either as principals, or as accessories in the first degree. Sir James Weir Hogg himself must see, that it is too late now to question so plain a fact. Even *his* cheek must blush, when he refers to the faithful page that chronicles his eloquence, and reads there how, in the month of May last, "he denied that any officers high in the service of the Bombay government—if by that was meant civil and military servants of the East India Company—had ever been convicted of corruption, or had ever had it imputed to them!" (Hansard's Debates, 1852, vol. cxx. p. 1387). Not above six weeks after electrifying a dull house with that startling statement, he gave a more sober, yet altogether insufficient tes-

---

them. The trades of enchanter and poisoner are united in the same person; and the drug is freely used for the credit of the enchantment. His life was more than once practised on by poisoners of this class, in the pay of the Durbar of the Guicowar, during his arduous labours at the court. The evidence of the medical officers of the Company stationed at Baroda,—Dr. Ogilvie, of the 13th Regt., Staff Surgeon, Dr. Style, of the 6th Regt., Vaccinator in Gujerat, and Dr Davey, of the 17th Regt., can establish the fact.—But the express' though it were the unsupported, assertion of Colonel Outram himself (p. 1475), is surely sufficient.

timony, to quite a different purport, as recorded in the Blue-Book—"The malpractices, which it has been our painful duty to notice, among the subordinate functionaries in the government offices at your Presidency, have been continued through many years, and are of a character injurious both to the public interests, and to the reputation of the British government.....We are compelled to add, that the result of these investigations, disclosing so much laxity in the management of a public office, and such instances of corruption among the subordinates employed in it, has made an unfavourable impression upon us, with respect to the general vigilance exercised by the heads of the department" (pp. 20, 21). Alas! for these poor "subordinates!" Cannot Sir James Weir Hogg find it in his heart, to say *one* word of the corruptions, practised by "heads of departments"? But it is the Chairman of the Court of Directors who censures corruption, and we must be content. Let us bless the giver, and not look the gift-horse in the mouth.

Above all, let us remember, that the men of the India House are not common men, nor to be judged by the laws common to humanity. All their system is mystery—"mystery of iniquity," perhaps—but still mystery. They act where other mortals would forbear; they forbear where these would act. Their facts, as we have seen, are never to be relied on; and with them a toward premiss is sure to produce an awry conclusion. They have commended —and dismissed—Colonel Outram, for his endeavours to reform their Bombay government. They have censured that government, and sustained with applause the policy which provoked the censure. They have shaken their

heads at Lord Falkland, and,—such is *now* the rumour,* have invited him to prolong, for another year, his administration, now on the eve of expiring. They have expressed a strong conviction of the guilt of the murderers and perjurers of Gujerat and their English confederates; and, in doing so, they have as strongly approved of the measures taken at Bombay to screen the gang from justice. They have wept over the sorrows of the bereaved and plundered widow, and have delivered her up to the tormentors. They have groaned over the misdeeds of their servant Mr. Reid, and put his name in their "House List" of candidates for the Directorship; an office which will confer, let us add, on the fortunate holder the bestowal of patronage to the tune of £17,000 a year. Finally, they profess that they have decided every one of these questions—and yet that every one of them remains undecided still; and, not only so, but that their Bombay government have not as yet enabled them to form any decision whatever respecting them!

"There is still one document proceeding from Lieut. Col. Outram," they say in their Political Letter of the 26th June, 1852—their *last* Despatch—(p. 26), "*on which our sentiments have not been expressed; namely, what is termed his 'Khutput Report.'* THIS DOCUMENT WE HAVE NOT YET RECEIVED FROM YOUR GOVERNMENT IN THE REGULAR MANNER; *as you intended to consider it in conjunction with the other replies on the same subject, which your Circular Letter,* [on Khutput] *to the heads of the several departments, in the Political, Revenue, and Judicial branches of the service*

* A rumour I regret to add, which is now almost ripened into a certainty. Since the publication of my second edition, the Court of Directors are understood to have formally adopted such a resolution and notified it to Lord Falkland!

had elicited..... WE THEREFORE SHALL NOT NOW ENTER INTO ANY EXAMINATION OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THAT REPORT."

Now "the Khutput Report" had been handed in to the Bombay government, by Colonel Outram, before the end of 1851. "The other replies, which the circular letter HAD elicited," were handed in, from those several departments, a twelvemonth before!

We are now in the month of February, 1853. But the vigilance of the Home government is still unequal to the magnitude of the purposed "examination." That examination has made no further progress. It remains where their "Political letter of the 26th June, 1852," left it. To all enquiries on the subject, the answers are still the same —"The papers have not come from India—they are under consideration in England—the draft of the proposed despatch is gone to the Board of Control." *

* A few days before the preparation of the third edition for the press, it became notorious in the clubs, that some faint impression of their absurd and lamentable position, in this respect, had reached at last the Court of Directors. The Chairman's "P. C," after receiving in that grub state the approval of the Board of Control, on the last Wednesday of February, became a chrysalis; and the draft of the despatch on Khutput was laid on the table of the Court. I rejoice to add, that a new protest was the first consequence, and that the second was still more important—Sir James Weir Hogg being left in a minority! A majority of one carried the insertion of several paragraphs, which though far short of the occasion, went infinitely further to the censure of Lord Falkland and his councillors than the Chairman thought convenient. The Directors appear to have found out, at last, to borrow a strong expression from Montalembert—"qu'il y a quelqu'un au dessous même du bourreau; C'EST SON VALET." It is a "mighty pretty quarrel as it stands," and I am loth to disturb it.

In the presence of all these facts, Parliament will not fail to recognise the indisputable title, which the Court of Directors have established, to a renewal of its confidence for the next twenty years to come, and to the re-enactment of their Charter Act without amendment.

APPENDIX.

SUPPRESSED DESPATCH OF COLONEL OUTRAM IN THE CASE OF BABA FUDKEE.

No. 131 of 1850.
From Lieut.-Col. J. Outram, C.B.,
Resident at Baroda.
To A. Malet, Esquire,
Chief Secretary to Government, Bombay.

Baroda, 22nd June, 1850.
Political Department.

Sir,—With reference to Mr. Secretary Goldsmid's letter to my address, dated 14th ultimo, No. 2,203, in reply to my communication under date the 11th April last, forwarding a petition from Venaik Moreshwur Furkey,* intimating that "Government having already, on a former occasion, declined to interfere in behalf of that individual, His Lordship in Council deems it inexpedient to re-open the matter,"—I am reluctantly compelled, by a sense of both duty and honour, again to address Government on the subject; in the hope, that a consideration of the facts which I have now to urge, in support of that individual's claim to the protection of Government, as a British subject, will satisfy the Right Honourable the Governor in Council of the propriety of revoking the decision by which I am precluded from investigating the case.

2nd. Being myself convinced of the petitioner's just claim to the rights of a British subject, and that I can substantiate that claim, I should be wanting in my duty did I shrink from soliciting from Government the revocation of what I consider an unjust decision; formed on a misapprehension of the rights of the case. But I am also called upon in honour to seek justice for this individual; because I have every reason to believe, and have little doubt, I shall be able to prove, that the persecution, which he has suffered arose from the aid which he had afforded to my-

* This variation in the spelling of the Fudkee's name occurs repeatedly in the Blue Books; the Mahratta *d* and *r* being in sound nearly identical.—*Note by* Indus.

self and others, in exposing the depravity of certain native officials not only of late, but in former years: the more especially, as it does appear, from the late acting Resident's* reply to the petition, forwarded with Mr. Goldsmid's letter, that His Highness the Guicowar must have been influenced, in dismissing the man from his service, in some degree at least, by the representations of that officer. And I am positively assured,—by the Durbar Carcoon, who attends at the Residency, that the further persecutions of which the petitioner complains—i.e., close imprisonment for upwards of 2½ months, the seizure of his papers, and the high security exacted from him, not only for good conduct, but also that he should not leave Baroda for three months (when, by proceeding to Bombay, he might have laid his case before Government, while His Highness the Guicowar and myself were both there),—were adopted with the sanction, if not at the instigation of the acting Resident.

3rd. As Venaik Moreshwur's petition alluded to above, was transmitted by Government to the acting Resident "for report," without restriction as to any particular point adverted to therein,——implying consequently that a full report was required,—I cannot understand why that officer should have avoided the opportunity, thus offered to him, of explaining other grave allegations contained in the petition, under the conception that no further reply was necessary than the rather inconsistent, if not unsatisfactory, one, which he has given to a portion of the petition merely, especially as Captain French states that he "would be happy to advert to each point of the complaint made by the petitioner," and would be glad to be allowed to do so.

4th. As before remarked, the petition having been sent by Government, *for the late acting Resident's report*, afforded the permission and *called for* the explanation *on every point*, which that officer expresses himself so desirous to be allowed to give. Unless, therefore, Captain French has causes, which I am not in possession of, for supposing that a full explanation would not be acceptable to Government, it is obvious that he should have been more explicit. But, as he states that he "could reply to each assertion made by the petitioner," and as he was well aware of the strong impression I entertained that great injustice had been done to the petitioner, I trusted that Captain French would gladly avail himself of the opportunity, to explain to myself what he had left unexplained to Government. Accordingly I addressed that officer officially on the subject. Copies of my letter and of his reply are appended, from which it will be observed, that the late acting Resident declines to afford me the information I requested—thus: "For my official acts at Baroda I am solely responsible to Government, and as they have not called on me to reply, as I offered to do, to unnoticed points in the petition referred to, I

* Captain (now Major) French.—*Note by* INDUS.

must decline, though very reluctantly, affording the information you require, unless called on to do so by his Lordship in Council."

5th. It rests with Government to judge, how far an officer, who had been officiating for a few months in a political office, is warranted in duty, if not in courtesy, in denying, except through the intervention of Government, any information in connection with its affairs, to the person at the head of that office for whom he had been officiating. But thus a second time withholding the information asked for in this case certainly seems little consistent with that eager desire to afford it, expressed by the late acting Resident; for he well knew that the information called for by me was intended to be communicated to Government. I have previously intimated to Captain French that I purposed making this appeal. It must, I think, satisfy the Right Hon. the Governor in Council moreover, that further explanation is necessary, to enable Government to judge, to what extent the acting Resident really did interfere in this matter; and the result will, I am confident, satisfy His Lordship, that the nature of that interference alone would render further investigation imperative, even if the petitioner were not, as I shall hereafter show, entitled to the protection of Government, as a British subject, whose persecution has arisen solely from the faithful manner, in which he had performed very important services to Government.

6th. The former decision of Government, not to interfere in behalf of this petitioner alluded to by Mr. Goldsmid, was grounded on the supposition, that Vernaik Moreshwur Furkey is not a British subject, to which it had been led by the late acting Resident thus erroneously reporting, on the 22nd November last, on that person's petition, dated 13th idem: "The petitioner is not a British subject, though originally years back he may have been." In the words of Mr. Secretary Willoughby, 8th January, 1846, No. 195; "He has resided at Baroda for the last seven years. He has in this respect forfeited the claims of a British subject." These words of Mr. Willoughby, as here put, would appear to have reference to this particular individual, whereas they were applied to an entirely different person; and in no respect could they apply to Venaik Moreshwur Furkey, who, although he may have at different times resided twice seven years at Baroda, cannot, by any interpretation, be said to have forfeited his rights as a British subject; for he ever has been, and continues to this day, the accredited Vakeel from the head of his own ancient family (that of the late Hurry Punt Furkey, who was Commander-in-Chief of the Peshwa's army), now residing, as also does the family of Venaik Moreshwur himself reside, on the family estates at Nassick, within the British dominions: by whom he was deputed to Baroda, some years ago, to prosecute certain pecuniary

claims against the firm of Hurree Bhugtee, which claims have not to this day been liquidated—although an order on the firm of the late Guicowar, directing their adjustment, was among the papers taken from him, on the occasion of his seizure and imprisonment, of which the petitioner now complains.

7th. In 1836, the late Guicowar expelled the petitioner from the city, and requested the Resident to send him out of the Guicowar's dominions. "On enquiry, however, that officer found that he had an undisputed claim on Syajee Row for a sum of money, which his absence would prevent any chance of his recovering, *as he was a British subject;* therefore he (the Resident) *refused to remove him until this claim should be settled.* This was not done until the month of August last (1837), since which his Highness has again been urgent for his departure from his territory. Venaik Moreshwur Furkey was therefore ordered by me to leave, and in reply has given in the enclosed yads, stating *the business which he has to transact, and producing a Mookteearnamah, from the head of the family, empowering him to act for him in this affair.*" Under the consideration of Venaik Moreshwur Furkey being a British subject, and holding the "Mookteearnamah" as Vakeel from the head of the family, for the prosecution of claims against one of the guaranteed firms at Baroda, the Resident referred the matter to Government, in a letter from which the above quotations are taken, dated 22d September, 1837, No. 710. I cannot find the reply of Government on the records, but conclude it must have admitted the right of Venaik Moreshwur Furkey to British protection; as he was not expelled from the Guicowar's territory, and has since continued at Baroda, as accredited Vakeel of his family, excepting during the period of 5¼ years, that he was employed in the British service, as head carkoon of the Rewa Kanta Agency—and eleven months in 1847-48, that he resided in Bombay, and with his family at Nassick.

8th. Moreover,—were not this individual's rights as a British subject secured to him by the formal "Mookteearnamah" alluded to, which, as recognized by both British and Guicowar's Governments, remains in force to this day,—he had not forfeited those rights by an "uninterrupted residence of seven years within the Guicowar's territory," on which assumption the late acting Resident so readily pronounced that he had no claim to British protection—For, at the date of that officer's report, 22nd November, 1849, it still wanted some months to complete the seven years, since Venaik Moreshwur Furkey was in the British service, which he had given up at the end of March, 1843; and it was then but one year and three quarters since he had been residing for nearly a year within the British territory.

9th. It is thus apparent that Venaik Moreshwur Furkey is

entitled as a British subject, to the protection of Government. I shall now satisfy the Honourable Board, that this person is most particularly deserving of that protection, and that he has suffered unmerited persecution, for many years past, solely owing to the very important services, which he rendered to Government in 1837, when, through his aid, you were enabled to bring to light the abominable system of bribery and corruption, which then prevailed throughout the native political establishment of the Residency. Without the zealous and unflinching assistance of Venaik Moreshwur Furkey on that occasion, it would have been impossible to have convicted the delinquents; consequently he incurred their bitter animosity, and that of their POWERFUL SUPPORTERS IN THIS COUNTRY. It is only by going through the whole correspondence which passd between the Resident, the Political Agents at Kattywar, and Mahee Kanta, and Government, during those bribery prosecutions in 1837-38—that any conception can be formed, of the vast difficulties and vexatious obstacles, by which your investigations in those cases were opposed at every step. Suffice it to say, I have no doubt you were as much impressed, as I myself was at the time, with the bold and independent spirit, with which this man openly stood forward in our aid on that occasion, (at a time when no other native, of whatever rank or station, dared to do so except clandestinely), in defiance of all the power, and wealth, and unscrupulous villany, by which the cause of the delinquents was supported.

10th. As a reward for his great services at that time, to the full extent and importance of which I can bear testimony,—for I was engaged with you in the arduous work of attempting to root out the corruption referred to,—Venaik Moreshwur Furkey was appointed, in December, 1837, head carkoon or native agent of the Rewa Kanta, and, as such, served under you until August, 1839, when on your departure for Kattywar, you recorded your sense of his services, in a certificate dated 19th of that month (copy appended), in which you certified to the zeal and ability, with which he had conducted not merely the duties of head carkoon at Rajpeerda, but also, in that capacity, those of head carkoon on the establishment of the first assistant Political Commissioner, and also as your head assistant in the sequestration of Pilland; and you thus conclude: "I can confidently recommend him for any employ, as a most useful, able, and honest man, and from his character, particularly fitted for the appointment he now holds" You had previously, moreover, thus testified [to] his services on the occasion of the Naikra settlement in 1838: "I have had much reason to be satisfied with the conduct of Venaik Moreshwur Furkey, my head native assistant, who, having formerly managed the Godra Districts, possessed much useful knowledge,

and whose acquaintance with the Mehwaree Thakoors of that part of the country was exceedingly serviceable to me."

11th. Venaik Moreshwur Furkey continued at the head of the Native establishment of the Rewa Kanta Agency, until the end of March, 1843, when he was removed from office, in rather a questionable manner, by Mr. Remington, then in charge of the Rewa Kanta. No charge of misconduct was brought against the Furkey, who had then filled the office 5½ years; but, without, explanation or warning, his situation was suddenly divided into carkoonships, and one of these, with proportionably reduced salary, he was told to retain if he pleased. This it does not appear clear whether he declined or not; but, not having promptly acceded, he found himself out of place altogether. He then petitioned Government for re-employment in its service. The petition was referred to Mr. Remington, then officiating Political Commissioner,—whose report, dated 22nd February, 1844, on which alone Venaik Moreshwur Furkey was condemned by Government; and declared a very "unfit person to be employed in any political capacity,"—displays, and even avows, so much prejudice against the man, that I must confess I am surprised that so serious an injury should have been inflicted by Government on one who had done so much in its service, on the grounds alone set forth in that document, without at least some further enquiry.

12th. The feeling by which Mr. Remington was influenced against this unfortunate man, is apparent from his own showing. "*From the very first I was struck with the high tone he* (Venaik Moreshwur Furkey) *assumed*, unlike any thing of the kind I had ever seen exhibited by others, holding a corresponding situation elsewhere, which, however suited to a native Durbar, was quite out of place in my Cutcherry. * * * * Feeling his continuance as the principal native officer in the Rewa Kanta establishment in every way injurious, *I sought his removal at a very early period;* which at last was effected by a new distribution of the salary he received." A prejudice thus appears to have been caused, by the independent manner of Venaik Moreshwur Furkey, so different from the comparatively sycophantish bearing to which, it would be inferred from these extracts, Mr. Remington had been accustomed before he entered the Political Department. However that may be, it is not likely that gentleman's dislike to his native agent would long escape the observation of the numerous enemies, by whom he was surrounded; and, to persons acquainted with the native character, it will be very apparent, how ably and zealously wily Brahmins, who had ready access to the ear of an unsuspecting English gentleman, would improve their advantage, by insinuating such representations, against their enemy the Furkey, as they saw best calculated to turn his master against

him. But is it not strange, that, with all his predispositions against this man, and surrounded by such ready and able assistants to spy out his misdeeds,—Mr. Remington should have been unable to adduce anything whatever, tending to criminate Venaik Moreshwur Furkey in any way, or to bring one single tangible fault against him, from the 15th August, 1839, when he received charge of the Rewa Kanta, until the 22nd March, 1843 (an interval of upwards of three and a half years), when he so dexterously got rid of the man, by lowering his position and depriving him of three-fourths of his salary?

13th. I do believe that not one native, of whatever rank in this country, out of one thousand, could have passed through the very trying ordeal, to which Venaik Moreshwur Furkey had been exposed, during his five and a quarter years' service in the Rewa Kanta, untainted by even an accusation of corruption or malversation in office. He succeeded to the position, from which one of the most inveterate of the Nagur fraternity, Motee Purshotum (who afterwards figured so conspicuously in the Dhackjee Dadajee affair in Bombay), had just been dismissed for corruptions, at the same time that others of the same fraternity had been expelled, for the same crime, from the Residency, and other political offices in Guzerat, principally through the exertions of the incumbent (the Furkey). The minor situations of those offices were still filled by the relatives of the discarded Nagurs; and their creatures still continued in various offices throughout the Rewa Kanta; all of whom were actuated by one interest and one spirit against Venaik Moreshwur Furkey—that of revenge. To effect his ruin was their constant object; his every act was watched; and, had he been caught tripping, not a moment would have been lost in exposing him; nay more, they would not scruple to throw temptation in his way; and I have not a doubt that many a tempting bribe has been placed, at their instigation, within his reach, with every inducement held out to swallow the bait. And what extraordinary facilities were afforded to Venaik Moreshwur Furkey to enrich himself by such means, had he been disposed to do so! Not a more prolific field for such gains then existed in India, perhaps, than the Rewa Kanta at that time; first, during the destructions caused by the Naikra disturbances; where every petty chief, who had in any way committed himself, would look to the native agent as the only means whereby to escape the penalty; next, from the attachment of Pilland, every land-owner in which district would try to secure better terms for himself under the new Raj, through the native agent; lastly, owing to the new arrangement, then being brought into operation, for the management of the Rajpeepla and other petty states;—all affording great facilities for illicit gains to the native agent, through whom all parties looked to effect their objects. Yet

not one single charge of any species of corrupt practice was brought against Venaik Moreshwur Furkey, during the five and a quarter years of his incumbency of the office of native agent in the Rewa Kanta, or was ever afterwards brought against him when he had left office.

14th. I question whether any native servant of Government ever passed a similar period of five years and a quarter, in any office in Guzerat, offering inducements, and affording facilities for bribery, without, as in this instance, a single accusation, or even imputation, being brought against him; even when no enmity was at work, as in this case, to draw the victim into error and then expose his crime. To show that such hostile supervision was actively employed, against every native servant who had in any way aided in the conviction of any members of the Nagur fraternity, I may instance the fact of Madowlall, the native agent in the Mahee Kanta,—through whose exertions chiefly I was enabled to establish the guilt of Dowlutram (Nagur) the head Karkoon of that agency,—having himself been convicted and dismissed, for a similar offence, within a year or little more of attaining his new office. Now this man possessed the highest testimonials from the gentlemen, under whom he had previously served in the Kaira Collectorate, where he had risen to the highest station (that of Dufterdar, if I recollect aright) a native could fill, before he was transferred to the Mahee Kanta. In his office, the opportunities for receiving, or the inducements to offer, bribes, were less, at the same time that the Nagur influence was much more limited, than what then existed in the Rewa Kanta; but, no sooner was Mahdowlall securely seated, as he thought, in his office, than he fell into snares, which the Nagurs had laid to test his integrity, and was lost. Again, in Kattywar, about the same time, a Mahomedan, of high character and educational acquirements, enjoying the friendship of many English gentlemen, named Mahomed Lootfulla,—who had aided Mr. Erskine in convicting Chotum Lall (Nagur) the head of the Native Establishment in that Agency,—having been appointed to the office from which the latter was expelled, similarly fell a victim to the temptations to which he was exposed, also I believe within about a year of his appointment.

15th. Surely with these examples before Government,—together with the fact that every native, who had heretofore filled a similar office to that which Venaik Moreshwur Furkey had maintained, under such adverse circumstances, without accusation or taint for five and a quarter years, whether in Kattywar or the Mahee Kanta, in the Rewa Kanta, or at the Baroda Residency, had been found corrupt,—the singular instance of integrity on the part of this individual might well have entitled him to more consideration from Government, than he met with, when, after getting rid of

him in the manner shewn above, Mr. Remington attempted to justify the treatment to which he had subjected the man, by his report dated 22nd February, 1844; which charges Venaik Moreshwur Furkey with no offence beyond that of an independant bearing, and maintaining a more extensive retinue of followers than Mr. Remington deemed suitable to his position, and proffers no ground for suspicion of his integrity, beyond a more libeal expenditure than Mr. Remington thought necessary, and the building of a house in Baroda which Mr. Remington estimated to have cost half a lac of rupees. I shall now test these grounds of Mr. Remington's objections and suspicions, merely here remarking, in anticipation of the argument occurring to the honourable board,—that the fact of no accusation or proofs of any kind having been brought against this person, might be the result merely of his superior tact and cunning;—that there is not a man in Guzerat, European or native, possessing any knowledge of the Nagurs and particularly of the individual character and abilities of those of the clan who were expelled from office in 1837-38,—of the extensive ramifications throughout the native establishments, in every office in Guzerat, by which they were assisted,—and of the all-powerful influences of the Guicowar court; and of the wealth of the banking firms of Baroda, by which they were supported,—who will not declare, that it was utterly *impossible* for any individual inimical to them, and therefore watched by them, to escape detection; if he had in any degree committed himself by a single dishonest act.

16th. With regard to Mr. Remington's objections, I have to remark that, with respect to the independent manner of Venaik Moreshwur Furkey, although doubtless different from the servility which Mr. Remington had been accustomed to meet with in his Collector's Cutcherry, in the Concan and Guzerat, to which that gentleman's services had, I understand, previously been confined,—it is but the demeanor which, he would observe in the Deccan, or elsewhere throughout India, generally prevails among the class of native gentry, of good family, such as that of the Furkey,—one of the oldest in the Deccan. It is a mere matter of taste; and I myself confess to prefer the independent bearing of the native gentleman, even though, through poverty filling a very subordinate position, to the cringing humility of the suitors who resort to our cutcherries. Mr. Remington's next objection is, that the Furkey's domestic expenses were unusually profuse;—and the number of servants and horses he kept up, and the large retinue which accompanied him about the country, indicated rather a man of rank than a mere Carkoon in our pay. It was at once evident that he was a man of unbounded means, and—independent of his salary, the—this expenditure, so inconsistent with his position on the establishment, remained to be provided from

illegitimate sources." Now, surely you, Sir, who preceded Mr. Remington in office, and had, for so long a period, witnessed the retinue and expenditure of the native agent, which, I have every reason to believe, continued under Mr. Remington just the same as it was under you, were as capable of judging, as that gentleman was, whether it exceeded the limit of the Furkey's legitimate means. That you did not think so is shown, by the fact that you did not object to it. But Mr. Remington appears to have put down to the train of the native agent all the suitors and others, who follow the camp of the political agent; and he does not seem to be aware, how far a salary of 200 Rupees per mensem would go, towards defraying the very limited wants of a numerous native retinue, should the recipient be so generous as thus to dispose of it. You, I have no doubt, must have been satisfied that the Furkey's expenditure did not exceed his salary. But admitting that it exceeded the income he derived from Government, it strikes me as being neither just nor generous to assume, on that ground alone, that the difference could only have been made good from illegitimate sources. Venaik Moreshwur Furkey, it is well known, is not only a man of family, but one of considerable private means. In illustration of this, it is merely necessary to mention, that a debt was recovered for him, through the Resident, in 1837, amounting to Baroda Rs. 12,815! and I understand that, from his first arrival here,—and therefore some years prior to his taking service under government, he owned a share in some loans, which he still retains, and derives an income from the interest thereof. The other, and only remaining, objection urged against the Furkey, by Mr. Remington was, that he "lately has constructed a stately house, in the most commanding situation of the city of Baroda, at a cost certainly not much under half a lakh of Rupees." In reference to this, I would simply observe, that the house in question occupies the site of the old Residency hospital, a part of the city in which, you are aware, no person of wealth or consideration resides;—and, in the matter of cost, the Durbar, which will not be supposed likely to frame a very low estimate in such a case, has just, at my request, given in a valuation of the said house, according to which the original cost is estimated at Rs. 32,933, and its present value at 23,477. The Furkey himself declares, that the entire expenditure incurred was Rupees 21,904; and he professes his readiness to produce accounts, which will prove the accuracy of his statement.*

* I had nearly overlooked another remark of Mr. Remington which calls for notice. That gentleman observes;—"Neither the present Resident, nor his immediate" predecessor (Mr. Sutherland), "regarded the petitioner favourably:"—to which I have to remark, that, were such the case, it ought not to weigh against the man;—because, employed as he was in the districts, and

17th. Such, and such only, are the grounds on which Government felt itself entitled to stigmatise, as "a very unfit person to be employed in any political capacity," this devoted servant; who alone, of all the native gentry, was found willing to brave the hostility of the most powerful classes in this country, by aiding in exposing the corrupt practices of the Nagurs; and one, who, subsequent to the assistance thus rendered us, had performed five and a quarter years' faithful service. And this decision went far beyond what even Mr. Remington looked for, whose only object was to oppose the claim, the Furkey had advanced, to be appointed native agent at the Residency of Baroda.

18th. On my return to Baroda in 1847, after an absence of some years, I was informed that Venaik Moreshwur Furkey had been dismissed from Government service, for misconduct; and the Government letter, dated 20th March, 1844, No. 905,* above referred to, was adduced to prove the fact. Being more sorry than surprised at such a consummation,—after the example of the native agents of the Mahee Kanta and Kattywar, who, I was aware, had, notwithstanding their previous high characters, been dismissedfor bribery with in a few months of their appointment,—I had little expectation that this individual could have avoided the contamination of the corrupt atmosphere of this court, to which he had been so much longer and more immediately exposed. I took his guilt for granted, therefore, on the strength of the Government decision conveyed in that letter,—refused to receive him at the Residency,—and it was not until driven to seek extraneous aid, to investigate the frauds committed in the Ghorajee Pol case, that I was induced further to think of this man; bearing in recollection, as I did, the great intelligence he had displayed, in unravelling former frauds connected with the same case; which were exposed by you in 1837 (vide your letter to Government, dated 15th December 1837, appended to which is the Furkey's report), This induced me to investigate the grounds, on which Government had come to its decision against Venaik Moreshwur Furkey; and a careful study of the whole case, so satisfied me that the Honourable Board had been misled into an act of great injustice towards that individual, by the report of Mr. Remington, that I should at once have appealed on his behalf, for a reconsideration of his case, had I not then learnt, that the prohibition of Government to his re-employment had been virtually annulled by a subsequent letter,‡ dated 5th July 1847,

having nothing to do with the Residents, it is impossible they could know anything about him; except what the court, and those who had access to the Residency, all being his enemies, chose to say against him.

* Copy appended, No. 4.

‡ Copy appended, No. 5.

with which he had been furnished, intimating that, although the Hon. the Governor in Council saw no reason for interfering on his behalf, he "might, on a vacancy occurring, apply to the local authorities;" which is tantamount in fact to rescinding the previous prohibition to his employment. This satisfied me that Government had become aware of the injustice of the previous prohibition, and that there could be no impropriety in my then making use of this able man's services, in any manner I might find necessary; and accordingly I did employ him, as reported in my letter to your address, dated 7th Sept. 1848, No. 215; and the zeal and ability, which he displayed on that occasion, were such as I trusted would be considered by Government a sufficient warrant, for my recommending him for the office of native agent here, which was then likely to become vacant.

19th. I observe that the Right Honourable the Governor in Council directed you, in replying to that report, after my departure to Egypt, under date 12th January 1849, to express the opinion of Government, that I had "greatly" erred in seeking extra aid in that inquiry "from a person whose employment in a political office" had before been forbidden by Government, "a procedure which makes it evident that he (Lieut.-Colonel Outram) could not have examined the records of his office." When this censure was penned, his Lordship in Council could not have been aware, that the prohibition alluded to, which was dated 20th March 1844, had been annulled by the subsequent communication under date the 5th July 1847. Under these circumstances, and in consideration of the facts which I have advanced above, tending so fully to exonerate this individual from the blame, a belief in which had caused Government to issue that interdict to his re-employment, will, I trust, render the Honourable Board desirous to relieve me from this censure.

20th. So far, however, from Venaik Moreshwur Furkey's exertions on that occasion, or my after-recommendation of him for this office, benefiting him in any way, all his late misfortunes and oppressions, of which he now complains, are to be attributed, he believes, to those circumstances; for they brought down upon him the aversion and the enmity of the native agent and his friends, who, having ready access to the late officiating Resident, easily succeeded in poisoning that officer's mind against the unfortunate man, as his enemies had previously succeeded in turning Mr. Remington against him. As Captain French has left, unreplied to, the allegations contained in Venaik Moreshwur's petition,—that his arrest and the seizure of his papers were ordered by his Highness the Guicowar, after consultation with the officiating Resident,—and his representations have been confirmed to me by the Durbar Karkoon and others, I can only assume that

those measures were adopted with the sanction, if not at the instigation, of the acting Resident. In that case, that officer unwittingly lent himself to a proceeding, by which the most innocent man might, in this country, and at this place especially, have his character blackened by unfounded crimes being palmed upon him through the foulest treachery, without a chance of righting himself; for, by permitting a Mahratta Durbar to seize any man's papers, without taking measures, at the same time, to secure their being *at once sealed up* in the presence of a person in whom he [the Resident] could confide, to prevent the possibility of their being tampered with, the door was thrown open for the practice of any villany, which the victim's enemies might choose to concoct against him. Such it will be seen, from the accompanying extract from a petition from the brother of Venaik Moreshwur,* was apprehended at the time; and it might naturally have been anticipated by the acting Resident, for whose neglect of the usual precautions in such cases I cannot account. For even admitting the fact of the Furkey being a Guicowar subject (which it has been seen that officer too readily assumed without due enquiry, on the information afforded him by the Native Agent I understand) still—if, as asserted, that violent measure was adopted *after* consultation with the Resident,†—whether that officer advised the measure or not, having become privy to the intention,—and being, by his position bound to tender advice to his Highness,—he ought to have advised this precaution. Moreover, he ought to have insisted on it, at least until Government should decide, whether the party about to be subjected to this illegality and violence was a British subject or not; for, although he (the acting Resident) chose to pronounce that the man was not a British subject, he was aware that his predecessors had, on the contrary, considered and treated him as such, and that too with the sanction of Government.

21st, Fortunately for the doomed victim, his enemies were unable to succeed in their intention; from, I presume, the difficulty they found in imitating the Furkey's hand-writing. For after two days' endeavour, they could produce nothing to criminate him, and the only documents which could be found (or fabricated) of a nature to be turned against him, were two

* Appendix, No. 6.

† If the acting Resident's wishes had not been consulted in this matter, why should the papers found upon the Furkey have afterwards been brought to that officer? And why should the Durbar have sent the message, five months afterwards, reported by Captain French on the 10th of April last, which message, I may observe, is very significant in other respects. This very day, I had a verbal message from His Highness, *asking if he should institute any further inquiry, touching the papers found in the house of Baba Furkey?*

said to have been found among the Furkey's papers, and although of a fictitious address, said to have been addressed to him; either of which the acting Resident pronounced "sufficient, from their contents, to warrant the proceedings of his Highness." In that case, it is a pity "their contents" were not communicated with Captain French's report, dated 23rd November last, which had thus referred to them,—if only to prevent the chance of future tampering with them, or at any rate, that having been made over to the acting Resident, he should not have retained them, or at least taken authenticated copies of them, before returning them to the Durbar,—or otherwise that he did not show them to his assistant, who might have retained a more distinct recollection of their nature, than he himself appears to possess, so far as I can judge from his replies to queries which, at my desire, Mr. Battye had put to Captain French on the subject. For I have much reason to believe, that one of these two papers has since been changed, from its being so very different from the recollection which Captain French has of its purport.

22nd. That such a fraud might be attempted is very possible, because the only parties who read their contents to Captain French, were the native agent and Durbar carkoon, (the parties most interested in injuring the Furkey), who, in their reliance on that officer's imperfect recollections, and well knowing that I should not be so easily satisfied as he was, may have taken advantage of the opportunity, of the papers being returned to their hands, to substantiate what they hoped might be more likely to impress me with his criminality. But the spuriousness of the paper referred to is transparent, and will, I doubt not, be proved on the investigation, which it is the object of this despatch to solicit permission for my entering into. The other paper, referred to by the late acting Resident, contains nothing to turn against Venaik Moreshwur; and both together, admitting their genuineness, would by no means warrant the illegal measures which were resorted to against this man—far less the most harsh manner in which those measures were carried out; nor his continued retention in close imprisonment for two and a half months, notwithstanding the repeated tender of most unexceptionable security; nor his being enlarged at last only on a heavy penalty, to deter him from leaving Baroda for three months, lest he should lay his complaint before Government, at the time when his Highness the Guicowar and myself were both at the Presidency.

23rd. The fact of Venaik Moreshwur Furkey having taken service under the Durbar for a period of six and a half months, can in no way lessen his claim to British interference, for, by the late acting Resident's own showing, in his reply to the Furkey's

petition dated 18th April last, it is evident that the man was dismissed from that service in consequence of Captain French's interference, and he was no longer in the service of the Durbar when the oppressions complained of took place.

24th. The circumstances above stated will, I confidently trust, satisfy the Right Honourable the Governor in Council, that it is necessary, and but just, that a thorough enquiry should be instituted into the case of Venaik Moreshwur Furkey, as set forth in his and his brother's several petitions, dated 13th November, 4th, 10th, and 20th December, 1849, and 7th March last.

I have the the honour to be, &c. &c.

(Signed) J. Outram.

A. Malet, Esquire,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Bombay.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

LETTER

TO THE

EDITOR OF THE "DAILY NEWS,"

IN ANSWER TO

CERTAIN REMARKS CONTAINED IN THREE CHAPTERS ON BARODA AFFAIRS, WHICH APPEARED IN THAT JOURNAL ON THE 23RD, 24TH, AND 25TH DECEMBER, 1852, AND HAVE SINCE BEEN RE-PUBLISHED IN A PAMPHLET SIGNED

"INDUS."

BY

LESTOCK R. REID, ESQUIRE.

Late Member of Council, Bombay.

"La promptitude à croire le mal sans l'avoir assez examiné, est un effet de l'orgueil et de la paresse. On veut trouver des coupables, et on ne veut pas se donner la peine d'examiner les crimes."—LA ROCHEFOUCAULD.

LONDON:

SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 65, CORNHILL.

BOMBAY; SMITH, TAYLOR, & CO.

1853.

354.5479
Rei/Let

TO THE

EDITOR OF THE "DAILY NEWS."

SIR,

Your issues of the 23rd, 24th, and 25th of December 1852, contain three "Chapters" on Baroda affairs, professedly drawn from the two volumes of the Blue Book, printed by order of the House of Commons on the 30th of June 1852. These chapters abound in aspersions on the character of myself and others, which are scandalously untrue, have no support in the book itself, and indeed may be readily refuted from its pages. The whole is a dishonest concoction, of falsehoods, which, in an ordinary case, would merit no elaborate refutation. In this country, however, so few possess a knowledge of Indian characters or affairs, or will consent to toil through two folio volumes of an Indian Blue Book, that possibly the vehement denunciations of a libeller may obtain some credence from their mere audacity and constant reiteration; especially when they find

---

NOTE. The numerical references are to the pages of the Blue Book, unless otherwise stated.

a place in a widely circulated journal, the editor of which has blindly lent himself to their dissemination. I come forward, therefore, to show, in as far as my own conduct is concerned, that the allegations of your correspondent are the results of mingled ignorance, rancour and mendacity.

The mis-statements which I shall point out in the course of the following observations, suffice to show that the writer of the chapters cannot have perused the Blue Book with the care and attention necessary to qualify him to argue upon the facts and reasonings which it contains. He has taken up the case against the Government and against its officers (always excepting those who may differ in opinion from the Government) with an unfairness and malignity which will be obvious to the most careless reader. He is credulous of every statement that may defame those on whom he has fixed himself. He imputes the vilest motives with no compunction, and with no proof. He is ready upon any, or without any, authority, to pass *ex parte* condemnations on distinguished officers; relying for the most part on vague rumours, alleged, by interested parties, to be current in one of the most profligate courts in India.

For the information of the general reader, I will briefly explain the constitution of the Bombay Government, and my connection with it, which has caused my name to be mixed up in these proceedings.

The Governor is the president, and the first of a Council of four members; the Commander-in-chief

being the second; and two civil servants the third and fourth. Resolutions are passed on the votes of the majority, the Governor having a casting vote. These usually take the form of minutes. In all cases the initiative is with the Governor. He either prepares his own minutes, having them, when necessary, copied in the office of his private secretary; or they are brought to him in draft, for his consideration, by the Secretary of the department, either in his handwriting, or copied in his office from his rough drafts. The latter is the usual process in all except cases of extraordinary importance, or cases in which a Governor himself possesses that Indian or practical knowledge which enables him to propose measures without consultation with any other party. From these minutes, if concurred in by the majority of the Board, orders are promulgated through four Secretaries, of the political, revenue, judicial, and military departments. By virtue of his seniority, the senior civil Secretary is Chief Secretary; but he exercises no control over the departments of his colleagues. Native correspondence is conducted by a deputy Secretary in the Persian department. The Governor, when on a tour in the provinces, has all matters of any importance referred to him. He is attended by a civil Secretary, who, while he aids in the general disposal of such matters, continues to conduct all the important business of his own department, the mere formal details of which are carried on by one of his colleagues at the presidency, whose duty, in respect to

such department, is merely to collate the drafts of letters to be issued, with the minutes on which they are founded; sign the letters themselves when prepared; and generally perform, for the absentee, any matters of mere routine.

Previously to 1831, I had held the office of principal collector and magistrate of the Konkun. For a few months in the beginning of 1832, I acted as Revenue Commissioner for Mr. Williamson (now Ramsay), succeeding that gentleman in May of that year as Secretary to Government, in the Revenue department. Ill health compelled me to proceed to the Cape of Good Hope in September 1835. I returned to Bombay on the 27th of November 1837; and in January 1838, became Chief Secretary, retaining charge of the Revenue department. In 1841, in consequence of some objection on the part of the political Secretary, I accompanied the Governor, Sir James Carnac, to Baroda; being absent on that occasion from the 21st January to the 12th February 1841. In September of that year, Mr. (now Sir George) Anderson selected me to fill a temporary vacancy in council. I resumed my office of Chief, and Revenue, Secretary in February 1842; assumed my permanent seat in Council on the 1st of March 1844; became acting Governor for six months in 1846-7; and finally left India on the 3rd March 1849.

I have never served in Goozurat, nor set foot in the province, except on the occasion of the three weeks' visit above alluded to in 1841. I have no

knowledge of the Goozuratee language, but am very familiar with the Muratee, which is the language of the court of Baroda, though unknown in the province beyond the precincts of the court. In the political affairs of Goozurat I never took the least interest, until my accession to council obliged me to consider those which came before me. These throughout my whole career as Secretary and member of the Government, were conducted, under the Governors and their Councils, by Mr. Willoughby, one of the ablest officers whom the Indian service has produced, but whose distinguished merits and services have screened him, no more than myself, from the shafts of malignant slander.

I will further add, that throughout my Indian service, I never hesitated to act upon, what appear to me, the wise and statesmanlike views of the late Sir John Malcolm, in my communications with all ranks and classes of natives. My knowledge of their language, from the earliest stage of my career, enabled me to converse with them, whether in official or private life, in the freest manner. I was haunted by no fears of misconstruction of the motives which led me to receive the visits of natives. I thought it as much my duty to receive them as to do any official act. The fears of "Khutput" had not raised a barrier between the governing, and the governed, portions of the community. I relied on my own character, as every honest man ought to do, to protect me from direct attack or malicious imputation; and I did what I deemed my duty,

fearlessly, and without regard to consequences. I felt myself above the atmosphere of suspicion.

With the above remarks, which are necessary to the elucidation of what follows, I proceed to consider the distinct allegations which are made against me. Your correspondent has mixed up into one heterogeneous farrago, a multiplicity of incongruous transactions, extending over a period of sixteen years, relating to different persons, and decided by different Governments. The transactions, so confounded, may rightly be separated under three heads.

First. A number of cases which may be termed the Nagur cases, and which were all, I believe, discussed and decided between 1835 and 1838.

Second. The alleged attempt to bribe the Bombay Government in 1840, not discovered nor discussed till 1842-3.

Third. The three cases of Jethabace Shetanee, Govindrao Guikwar, and Guorojee Pol, in which Nursoo Punt is concerned, and which will require particular notice, as they occurred, or the consideration of them commenced, while I was a member of the Government.

The Nagur cases occupy the whole of the first "Chapter," and part of the second. They relate to the prosecution, for malpractices, of certain Brahmuns in public employ in Goozurat, of the *Nagur

Note. The real designation of this caste of Brahmuns is "Nagu," or "Naga," a Hindoo legend deriving their origin from

caste. My name is early introduced in connection with them, for the evident purpose of losing no time in associating it with base suspicions. It required, indeed, no small ingenuity to represent me as in any way concerned in these cases. During two of the four years of their progress, I was absent at the Cape of Good Hope. Even when in Bombay, I was neither a member of the Government, nor Secretary of the department in which they were considered. I never was consulted in respect to them; nor, had I been so, could I have given advice, for I was ignorant of every particular connected with them, and am so to this day, except so far as I have very recently heard them spoken of, and seen them alluded to in the cursory view which I have taken of those parts of the Blue Book in which my name is not specifically mentioned. Several of the letters of 1838 may bear my signature. That cited by your correspondent is dated at a period when the political Secretary, Mr. Willoughby,

"Mr. Secretary Reid, whose name will be found painfully connected with worse intrigues hereafter, declined the recommendation, &c."—Chap. I.

---

the "Nag" or Cobra de Capello. With the view, probably, of holding them up to public detestation, as endowed with all the evil attributes of that venomous reptile, Col. Outram terms them the "Snake caste," and "Snake fraternity." But others describe them as an intelligent race, and celebrated among their countrymen for qualities the reverse of those thus assigned to them. Col. Outram may have been deceived by the mere sound of the name, or, as I understand he does not speak, read or write either Goozuratee or Muratee, (the languages alone in use in Goozurat,) his interpreters, if unfriendly to the Nagus, may have misled him.

1841-2.

was with Sir Robert Grant in the Deckan. Others were issued at a time when the same officer had been specially permitted to hold himself aloof from the disposal of these cases. As already stated, however, beyond the duty of seeing that the letters issued were in accordance with the minutes, and the manual operation of signature, I had no concern with them. The decisions emanated, as the records will demonstrate, from two persons altogether above the charge of either baseness or incapacity—the late excellent Sir Robert Grant, then Governor, and his able colleague, Sir George Anderson, now Governor of Ceylon.

My name could have been mixed up in this set of cases only by one entirely ignorant of the subject, and quite reckless of his assertions. I will add only one more observation. The folly and unfairness of assuming that the Secretary signing a letter is, therefore, responsible for its contents, may be fully established from the papers under consideration.

1379. In these Nagur cases Col. Outram was guilty of that injustice towards his friend, Mr. Willoughby; he discovered his error, and made an apology; but he does not seem to have taken warning. The injustice has been repeated as respects myself; to expect an apology from your correspondent would be to give him credit for some sense of shame. I shall therefore pass on.

We now come to the alleged attempt to bribe the Bombay Government, in 1840. On this subject, there appears, in Chap. II, more than a column of

loose surmises and vituperation, but an utter neglect of facts and no mention of details, with which the writer has taken no trouble to make himself acquainted. The history of this transaction is briefly as follows:—

During Sir George Arthur's government, information was obtained that Dhakjee Dadajee, a disgraced minister of His Highness the Guikwar, and long resident in Bombay, had extorted large sums of money from his former master, under pretence of bribing the Governor and other parties, during the administration of Sir James Carnac. It was understood that this fraud would be brought home to him were his papers seized; they were seized, but the information desired was not obtained. Dhakjee sued the Government in the Supreme Court for heavy damages, and was nonsuited; simply, I believe, in consequence of some informality in his legal proceedings. I am not familiar with the particulars of this case. It occurred ten years ago, and was not conducted in the department over which I presided as Secretary. But I believe that Mr. Howard, the acting Advocate-general, pleaded the nature of the papers which it was expected to discover, as justificatory of the act of the Government in having had recourse, under his advice, to the extreme measure of issuing the search warrant.

In investigating a case of this nature, no difficulty can arise to an unprejudiced mind in distinguishing two very different issues, viz.:—first, whether Dhakjee Dadajee was guilty of having obtained

money on the false pretence of bribing certain functionaries;—and next, whether those functionaries were guilty of having received the money as bribes. Yet, strange to say, your correspondent seems unable to comprehend such distinction. He finds it convenient to confound the two issues, and, under cover of the confusion, to insinuate a charge against the Government, and then to assume that it must be true.

That His Highness the Guikwar may have consented to such appropriation of certain sums, is by no means improbable; but that such sums ever reached, or were intended by those who procured them (if they ever did so) to reach the parties indicated, no one, in those days, thought for a moment of assuming. There was no accusation to "shock," or to "repel." No one was ever asked to disprove the receipt of what had never been alleged to have been received. The facts, as they are now known, were then known. They were declared openly in the Supreme Court; yet no thought was ever harboured of there being any real charge against Sir James Carnac, or against any of the parties named. For my own part, having never had any concern in Baroda affairs, or with a single individual of or from Baroda, and viewing the mention of my name among the intended recipients as arising solely from the accident of my having accompanied the Governor on his tour to that capital, I looked upon the whole affair as one of those efforts, which are of daily occurrence, where an unscrupulous scoundrel endeavours to obtain money by

nefarious means from a credulous dupe, and I have since scarcely given the matter a thought.

The manner in which your correspondent has first taken for granted this novel allegation against myself, and then paraded it in every column, and worked it into every case, is so characteristic of his propensity blindly to defame that I cannot abstain from further noticing it. I have to deal with the insinuation that the money was received by Dhakjee, and passed beyond him. The evidence proffered by your correspondent to his readers on this head is;—a statement of the native agent Heeralal (a man, I may observe, afterwards dismissed for corrupt practices);—the alleged silence of the 1400.
Bombay Government;—and certain alleged rumours at Baroda. What then does Heeralal state? So far as I can discover, nothing but this,—that His Highness the Guikwar, having been informed that satisfactory negociations had been made with certain functionaries, ordered money to be transmitted to his agents on their behalf. Here is no hint of the money having passed Dhakjee. I can discover no more than this statement which, at all events, I am not concerned to refute. Again, the Bombay Government, we are informed, were submissively silent under these imputations. This is wholly untrue. The proceedings of 1842-43 exhibit a most indignant and summary vindication of the character of the Government; and though they ended in no absolute discovery, yet they occasioned the transmission to His Highness the Guikwar of letters of the severest warning and rebuke. Lastly, it is said the

corruption was universally credited at Baroda. If this were established, (by more than the asseverations of a partizan), it would yet prove nothing. That corrupt men will easily believe innocent men to be as vile as themselves, is not remarkable. That innocent men may be industriously maligned, your correspondent appears to know. But what should be especially remarked is this:—of all the sweeping assertions of rumours to my prejudice in Baroda, not one was noticed to the Government while I was in India; not one was known to me until, after the publication of the "Chapters," I read them lately in the Blue Book; and yet your correspondent would have had me divine them before I had learnt their existence;—nay, deny them before they were made.

Chap. II. Col. II.

I will now adduce a few instances in order to show how carefully your correspondent has studied the Blue Book. He has contrived not to misstate the fact of my having left India. I did so on the 3rd March 1849, before, on Colonel Outram's return from Egypt, the Government, and I in particular, fell so deeply under his displeasure. But he tells us that Mr. Willoughby is still a member of the Bombay Government. This gentleman vacated his seat in Council and left India, in April 1851, about twenty months before the appearance of the "Chapters,"—little less before that of the Blue Book,—and before the date of much of the correspondence which forms the subject of those volumes. Is it possible that any one studying that book so as to master its contents, could be ignorant of this, and,

having before his eyes minute after minute of the Bombay Council, not be aware of the fact that Lord Falkland had other colleagues?

He next states that Mr. Malet succeeded Mr. Reid in the post which he still fills of Secretary to the Bombay Government. This is also incorrect. I relinquished the office of Revenue Secretary on entering Council in March 1844, being succeeded in my department by Mr. Townsend, and as Chief Secretary by Mr. Willoughby. Mr. Malet never was Revenue Secretary. He succeeded Mr. Willoughby as political (and, I believe, chief) Secretary in April 1846, and never was, as your correspondent asserts, political Commissioner of Goozurat. Chap. II. Col. II.

I now proceed to notice your correspondent's remarks on the intricate case of Jethabaee Shetanee, the second widow of a member of a banking firm at Baroda, that of Huree Bhugtee, which possessed the British guarantee. The pith of his assertions, so far as I am concerned in them, is briefly as follows: Chap. II. Col. II.

> This lady was grievously persecuted. She petitioned Government, twice, for redress. It was refused. Then Colonel Outram discovered the truth of her story. "Some time "previously Mr. Reid had received a letter, "intimating that it would be to his benefit "to procure decisions in certain cases in "favour of the firm of Huree Bhugtee." "To Mr. Reid does Colonel Outram dis- "tinctly attribute the long and scandalous

"delays of justice in these cases." Colonel Outram tarried six weeks in Bombay, "and "urged the affair in person, but in vain." "The only answer I could get was, 'Your "reports are still in Mr. Reid's hands.'" Colonel Outram, "worn out with hope, de- "jected, left Bombay for Egypt." "Imme- "diately after his departure, the cases were "decided in favour of those base miscre- "ants." (Baba Nafra and Nursoo Punt.)

Surely, reading this, one would suppose that the case in which I had interfered to prevent justice;—in which Col. Outram had attributed to me "long and scandalous delays;"—in reference to which he had been driven, "worn out with hope, dejected" to Egypt;—and which was decided immediately on his departure;—was the case of Jethabaee. The slightest reference to the Blue Book will show the falsity and malice of your correspondent's assertions on this point, and will prove with what "industry and patience" he has made the examination of these volumes.

The case of Jethabaee, as it now stands, (that is, since she has been shown to be an injured woman), did not come before Government until after Col. Outram's return from Egypt, and long after I had left India. The first mention that I can find of suspicion on his part that she had been unfairly dealt with, is
774. in his letter of the 24th June 1850. The ill treatment of which she complained was of prior date.
325. She had presented two petitions to Government on

15th June, and 29th July 1847; these had been referred to Col. Outram. On the 29th November 1847, Col. Outram, having been again called upon for his report, addressed Government. These proceedings are not given *in extenso* in the Blue Book; but from his account of his letter (*vide* par. 17 of his letter of the 31st March 1851), it does not appear that he then entertained any very definite opinion of Jethabaee's being an ill-used person; and from that date up to the time of his proceeding to Egypt, I have found in the Blue Book no intimation of his having communicated further with the Government on the subject, except, probably, on some immaterial point. 328.

The case was left by Col. Outram for his successor, Capt. French (a successor, I may add, of his own indication). The reports of this officer on the subject are not in the Blue Book. I find, however, that he made one report on the 22nd February 1849 (a few days before I quitted India), which was not answered till the 21st May 1849. The result seems to have been, that as this lady would not join in the appointment of a Punchayut (arbitrators chosen by both parties), the Government declined to interfere further in her case. 882. (note.) 351.

In this decision the home authorities, that is, the Court of Directors and the Board of Control, concurred (*vide* Letter of 13th February 1850); and in a subsequent dispatch of 2nd June 1852, having had before them the proceedings consequent on Col. Outram's having reopened the case, they dis- 770. 9.

tinctly tell the Government, "You could not, at "any period of this unfortunate affair, have acted "otherwise than you did on the information you "possessed."

I may refer on this subject to Mr. Willoughby's
393. minute of the 28th April 1851; Lord Falkland's
404. minute of the 10th November 1851 (pars. 62 to
427. 68); and the Government letter of 1st December 1851 (pars. 43, *et seq.*). So far as I am personally concerned, I need not again allude to this case. It is clear, that as a case of gross tyranny and injustice (if it be so), it came forward long after I had left India; and that your correspondent has evinced either an utter disregard of truth, or utter carelessness in consulting his premises, in attributing to me any concern whatever in it.

Chap. II. Col. II. The circumstances connected with the letter to which your correspondent alludes, as received by me "some time previously," and which I find often
1406. (and sometimes not very fairly) referred to in Col. Outram's proceedings, are briefly as follows:
1082. 1217. Mr. Willoughby and I received anonymous letters, dated the 10th of April 1848, written apparently in a female hand, and addressed to ladies of our families, stating that it would be to our advantage to befriend the firm of Huree Bhugtee in some dispute with the Shastree's sons. Both Mr. Willoughby and myself mentioned the receipt of those letters at a subsequent Council. Mr. Willoughby produced (and now has) that sent to him. Mine I afterwards destroyed, as worthless.

These letters, and more particularly that addressed to me, are frequently alluded to in the proceedings subsequent to Col. Outram's return from Egypt; and all the use that can, however tortuously, be made of them, has been so. Col. Outram says in his Khutput Report, part II. sec. III. par. 37, that he procured information of their existence from Mr. Willoughby's "written statements," and again (in p. 1406 note) "Mr. Willoughby duly recorded this "insolent proceeding, and doubtless Mr. Reid did the "same." To what written statements of Mr. Willoughby Col. Outram had access, (for his minutes as a member of Council could not have been legitimately known) I cannot find. Mr. Willoughby did not, any more than myself, place anything on record at the time of the receipt of these letters, contenting himself, as I did, with mentioning the fact at a subsequent meeting of the Board. But on the 17th July 1850, long after I had left India, I find that he circulated the original note he had received, with a minute alluding to the fact of my having received a similar note, and my having mentioned this in Council at the time when he did. An account of this transaction will be found in the Chief Secretary's memorandum of the 22nd January 1852.

1406. (note.)

1217.

1082.

Under the view which I have ever taken of anonymous communications, I deemed these letters at the time to be of not the slightest importance, knowing them to be utterly powerless in influencing our decision in any matter that might come before

1082. us. There was, as stated by the Chief Secretary, no clue whatever to trace their origin. To Col. Outram, however, nothing was impossible. He at
1058. once "had no doubt from whom it came,"—that is, the letter sent to my house;—and he probably had no greater doubt in respect to that sent to Mr. Willoughby; although my name is here, as elsewhere, for obvious reasons, prominently brought to notice. He decides peremptorily that Baba Nafra
1406. (note.) had "caused it to be written," and treats this throughout as an indisputable fact.

Now, even on this point, it is just as likely that he may be in error, as that he may be right. If the Shastree's son, or any opponent of the firm, wished to prejudice the members of the Government, or others with whom the ultimate decision of a dispute rested, against the firm, he could not do so more effectually than by sending such letters; for their obvious effect would be to create in the minds of such parties a feeling of indignation at the attempt made to corrupt them. On my guard against such a trick, I cared little whether the letter came from the one or the other party; satisfied that, when any case came before me, I could judge it on its merits, with strict impartiality, and without reference to the artifices of either disputant.

1406. (note.) Col. Outram's observation, that the Government ought to have assumed (without a shadow of proof, be it remarked) that Baba Nafra had caused these anonymous letters to be written; and that, when it passed a decision not adverse to the firm (though I

have shown elsewhere, that in the case to which he alludes, that of Govindrao Guikwar, the decision of Government was adverse—more so than Col. Outram had himself proposed in some points, although it did not withdraw the British guarantee,) it should have informed the firm that such decision was passed "in spite of, and not in consequence of," certain anonymous letters, received many months before, and having reference to a totally different case, is too absurd to require further comment.

Vide page 27 of this letter.

The cases in the decision of which Col. Outram attributed delay to me, were wholly unconnected with Jethabaee. They were the cases of Govindrao Guikwar, and Guorojee Pol, two Murata chiefs of rank in the Baroda state, who, as holding the British guarantee, were entitled to have their disputes with their creditors enquired into by the Resident. They were brought before Government in Col. Outram's letters of the 31st August, and 7th September, 1848. In the former, the firm of Huree Bhugtee was concerned, but not in the latter. In both Col. Outram noticed what he deemed the discreditable conduct of Nursoo Punt, the native agent; recommending at the same time that he should be leniently dealt with. His letters contain no allusion to the fact, since so prominently adduced, of Nursoo Punt's family connection with Baba Nafra, the managing partner of Huree Bhugtee's firm, and others at Baroda;

N.B. In his memorandum of the 22nd January, 1852, p. 1082, Mr. Malet mentions "the case of "Huree Bhugtee "v. Guorojee Pol." This seems an error, as Pol's dispute was with his Paruk (Banker) Jugjeewan Kandas, and not with Huree Bhugtee's firm.

of which indeed, he tells us, he was not cognizant
964. till about the middle of October 1850.

It is somewhat strange that though Col. Outram was Resident from May 1847, he had not, till nearly three and a half years subsequently, ascertained that there was any connection between his native agent and any parties at Baroda, although a former Resident in reporting to Government on
944. the anonymous petition of March 1844 (to which so much importance has been since attached), had stated the particulars of such connection.

When, on the 9th September 1848, Col. Outram forwarded Nursoo Punt's application for permission to retire, and, in consideration of his eminent services, for some pension beyond what the ordinary rules awarded to him, he did so with his "recommendation." Not a word was then said of suspicion—not a word of warning to the Government not to decide on the request for extra pension till the case of Pol had been disposed of. It is clear that at that time Col. Outram had no very strong opinion of Nursoo Punt's guilt. He brought against him no distinct
1056. charge of criminality, and admits that all he desired was to get rid of him from his office, and this no doubt was all that his protegé, Furké, cared for also.

Before proceeding further to notice these letters, I must say a few words on the subject of this Nursoo Punt, describing who he is, and what has been my connection with him. This "miscreant," as he is termed by your gentle correspondent, was, up to the time when Colonel Outram first found reason

to be dissatisfied with him in 1848, a man of unblemished reputation. My own knowledge of him up to that period was this:—He was brought into the Revenue Commissioner's office by Mr. Williamson Ramsay, under whom he had long served in Goozurat. When I had temporary charge of that office, in the beginning of 1832, before Mr. Williamson Ramsay joined, Nursoo Punt was with that gentleman, in attendance on Lord Clare. It was not, then, from his having at any time served under me that I was acquainted with him. I knew him solely from his high and honourable character of being the most distinguished native revenue officer whom the Bombay Presidency had produced. He was highly esteemed by all successive Revenue Commissioners and their assistants, and it was from Mr. W. Ramsay,[1] Mr. Vibart,[2] Mr. H. B. Frere,[3] Mr. Goldsmid,[4] and Mr. Pringle,[5] in their official reports and verbal communications, that I formed my estimate of his character. On Mr. W. Ramsay's retiring from office, he represented the value of Nursoo Punt's services in so strong a light, that, at the recommendation of Mr. Farish's government, the Court of Directors bestowed on him a village in Inam for three lives, of the value of rupees 1,200 per annum. While he was Dufturdar to the Revenue Commis-

[1] Retired as Revenue Commissioner.
[2] Retired as Revenue Commissioner.
[3] Now Commissioner in Scinde.
[4] Now Secretary in the Revenue Department.
[5] Retired as Commissioner in Scinde.

sioner, I was in the habit, whenever he came to the Presidency, of receiving a complimentary visit from him, as the Secretary of his department, as I was in the habit of receiving those of all collectors' Dufturdars, Mamledars, or other native officers. But these visits were but few and infrequent, for the duties of the Revenue Commissioner led him, for the greater part of the year, to a distance from the Presidency.

I take this date from the Blue Book.—Page 944.

In the year 1843 Nursoo Punt informed me of his desire to change his wandering mode of life, which he said had undermined his health, for one of more ease and quiet in his native country of Goozurat, and of his wish to become native agent at Baroda. I say, he informed me, because I recollect perfectly warning him of the danger of taking service in a place which was known to be so vile a sink of corruption as Baroda, and pointing out to him that he would incur the risk either of being himself contaminated by a residence in such a nest of villainy, or of losing his present well earned reputation, though he might be as virtuous as an angel. I believe many others urged this in similar terms. However, he preferred his own course. The Resident, Mr. Boyd, nominated him to the office, and the government of Sir George Arthur

944. confirmed the nomination on the 23rd December 1843. I need scarcely say that I had no concern whatever in his appointment; because, could that have been alleged, it no doubt would have been made a prominent charge against me. I believe no

one at that time knew that he was connected with any people at Baroda. I certainly did not.

Nursoo Punt thus left the Revenue Department, and so, for a time, ended my interest in him. I heard little or nothing of him, certainly nothing to his disadvantage, till Colonel Outram, in his letters of the 31st of August and 7th of September 1848, represented his conduct, in the two cases of Govindrao Guikwar and Guorojee Pol, in an unfavourable light. I now learn from the Blue Book 1401.
that in March, 1844, a petition had been sent to Government against Nursoo Punt, which proved to 944.
be fictitious;—to such, I am sorry to perceive, that Colonel Outram has an extraordinary partiality. I 1410,
cannot say I did not see this petition, for I entered par. 49.
Council in that month; but it certainly made no impression on my memory, and I may conscientiously use, in reference to my knowledge of him in 1848, the words of Colonel Outram, "I never heard a 1403.
word whispered to his disadvantage." He held, in his line of the service, as high a position as Colonel Outram did in that in which fortune had placed him, and was equally entitled to the support and countenance of the Government.

In respect to the alleged persecution of Furké by Mr. Willoughby, Mr. Malet, and myself, I will remark that your anonymous correspondent favours us with no details with convenient reference to the pages of the Blue Book, which would enable me, without wading through a mass of irrelevant matter, to understand what part I can be said to

have had in these transactions. I am aware of having had none. I never knew any thing of Furké. Colonel Outram named him in his letter on Guorojee Pol's case as "former agent in the Rewa Kanta, not now in Government employ," and likewise in his letter of the 9th September 1848, in which he proposed him as successor to Nursoo Punt in the native agency; but he omitted all mention of what subsequently transpired, viz: that he had been under disgrace, however unmerited. I was previously ignorant of all his antecedents. I did not know that he had ever been persecuted at all.

Neither Col. Outram's letters of the 31st August 1848, and 7th September 1848, in the disposal of which he attributes delay to me, nor the proceedings of Government upon them are to be found in the Blue Book; nor are the proceedings on Nursoo Punt's application for his pension. I regret these omissions, because I believe the proceedings in question to be the sole origin of all the insinuations which have been so liberally dealt out against me by those in whose hands Col. Outram placed himself on his return from Egypt.

1408. Seeing so deliberate a charge of delay in answering these letters brought against me, and being unable from the Blue Book to ascertain the real facts of the case, I was disposed at first to think that there might be some grounds for the imputation, and—while most distinctly and unreservedly declaring that such delay, whatever it might have been, was no more than was usual in hundreds of

instances, where matters requiring special consideration were allowed to lie over until time could be found, under the pressure of other business, to write upon them—to disclaim all notice or design in not bringing the matter at once to a conclusion, so far as I was concerned; especially as there was nothing apparent on the face of Col. Outram's letters calling for extreme or unusual haste.

I have since ascertained the following facts relative to these letters:—The first, that of the 31st of August 1848, related to the affairs of Govindrao Guikwar. In it Col. Outram, besides finding fault with the conduct of Nursoo Punt, recommended that the firm of Huree Bhugtee should receive rupees 83,153 4 11, instead of about three lacs which it claimed; and that, for alleged misconduct, it should be deprived of the British guarantee. It does not appear on what date that letter reached the Government. Lord Falkland's minute upon it bears date the 20th of November 1848, that is, seventeen days after Col. Outram had gone to Egypt. He proposed the reduction of the above sum to rupees 68,777 3 7, and requested the opinion of his colleagues on the question of withdrawing the guarantee. My minute bears date the 24th of November 1848. I entered minutely into the case; and, adopting a suggestion which Nursoo Punt, the native agent, had made to Col. Outram, but of which that officer took no notice, I proposed to reduce the sum to rupees 64,000. I objected to the withdrawal of the guarantee for reasons which

I assigned. I further stated that in disposing of the second case, that of Guorojee Pol, I would notice Nursoo Punt's alleged misconduct. Mr. Willoughby minuted on the 2nd of December 1848. He agreed with me, both as to the amount of the debt, and in objecting to the withdrawal of the guarantee. The Governor assented to our views in a further minute of the 5th December 1848, and the decision was communicated to the acting Resident, Capt. French, on the 15th December 1848.

Col. Outram, throughout the Blue Book, denounces the Government for the iniquity of its decision in not having carried out his suggestion of withdrawing the guarantee. It did not apparently occur to him that had his advice been followed, the "atrocious" case of Jethabaee could never have come under the cognizance of any British authority. It was solely as widow of a member of a firm possessing the guarantee that she could claim the interference of the British Government; and the cancelling of the guarantee would at once have abandoned her to the tender mercies of the Baroda Durbar. Col. Outram cannot say that he desired to punish by this means Baba Nafra, the managing partner, only; for in his letter of the 31st August, 1848, par. 8, he particularly alludes to "the widows and children of the late suocar" (banker), as having, in conjunction with "the "banking firm which they carry on in his name," "fairly forfeited the protection, &c," "by dishonesty "in their pecuniary transactions through their ma-

"naging partner and representative, Baba Nafra." Is it not a fair deduction from these facts, that up to the date of the letter in question, Col. Outram did not think Jethabaee the injured person he has since declared her to be?

After the foregoing exposition of dates and facts, how is it possible to uphold Col. Outram's declaration, so far as this letter of the 31st of August 1848, is concerned, that any delay whatever originated with me? The Governor's minute of the 20th November 1848 must have been framed before I saw the papers at all, because its views as to the settlement of the debt differed from mine; and as my minute is dated the 24th November 1848, I must have been rapid, rather than dilatory, in coming to a decision.

The second letter, that relating to Guorojee Pol's affairs, bears date the 7th September 1848. But Mr. Malet, the chief Secretary, distinctly states that, though so dated, it reached his office only on the 18th September 1848. Col. Outram arrived in Bombay on the 17th September, 1848. Possibly, he brought it with him; but if so, why was it ante-dated? Every letter ought to bear the date on which it is dispatched. At least, no argument should be founded on the date, to the injury of the party receiving it, unless dispatched on such date. 1244. 1405 1406. par. 37.

The Governor's minute on this letter is dated the 28th December 1848. Of that minute, so far as it disposes of the allegations against Nursoo Punt, I am most willing to take upon myself all the

responsibility. The views contained in it were my views. There is not one line which, on reconsideration, I would desire to alter. It was written on the advice which I gave in perfect honesty and good faith. If my memory rightly serves me, I wrote, as for myself, a draft of minute, which formed the groundwork of that finally adopted by the Governor. I have discovered no record of the date when my draft was submitted to the Governor; or when, the views in it having met his approbation, it was taken by the chief Secretary, or delivered into his office, in order to be worked up, in its present form, as the minute of the President. It must, however, have been well known to many clerks in the office, and through them to Col. Outram and his informants, that the Governor's minute was framed on my original draft. Hence the animosity of the whole party against me in particular. For the reasons above detailed, I simply subscribed the minute, as put forth by the Governor. Mr. Willoughby recorded a separate minute on the 31st
1083. December 1848. The decision of Government, founded on these minutes, was sent to the acting Resident on the 12th of January 1849.

Another fact has become known to me, on wading through the Blue Book, which shows that, long before Col. Outram left for Egypt, the questions involved in these letters affecting Nursoo Punt must have been, in some degree, determined. The application of this person for pension, sent by Col.
1244. Outram to Government on the 9th September 1848,

was, after going through the usual form of submission for the opinion of the Civil Auditor, circulated to the members of Government on the 26th of September 1848. His petition of the 18th September 1848 was also circulated on the same date. 958, 1244. On this latter is a minute of the Governor, dated 7th October 1848, signed also by Mr. Reid, and Mr. Willoughby. "See my minute of this date, "on Nursoo Luximon's (Nursoo Punt) application "for leave to retire on a pension." That minute is given in p. 1245. It alludes to the probability of Nursoo Punt's application having arisen from his inability to serve under Col. Outram "after what "he may have considered the unjust treatment he "has met with at his hands;" allows him to reconsider it; and negatives the demand for extra pension; on the grounds of his services having been already amply rewarded. It is impossible to suppose that the Governor could have written this, or that his Council would have concurred in it, (it does not indeed appear *when* they concurred,) had they not all had under their consideration the whole of the papers connected with the charge of misconduct brought against Nursoo Punt in the two cases submitted by Col. Outram. This, be it observed, was about a month *before* Col. Outram left for Egypt. What then becomes of the delay attributed by Col. Outram, so often and so pointedly, to me alone?

I write on this matter, not in any reliance on my memory, but solely as arguing from dates of official documents of which I have only recently become

cognizant. My previous impressions (arising probably from having heard rumours that Col. Outram had attributed the delay to me, and a belief that he would not have done so entirely without grounds,) were that I had the papers some time by me: but if the dates of the documents I have quoted are cor-
1405. rect, I confess myself at a loss to account for Col. Outram's assertion that he was informed "during "the six weeks he remained in Bombay, that the "papers were still in Mr. Reid's hands."

Col. Outram, in his Khutput report, Part II Sec.
1405. III par. 34, has not mentioned the parties to whom he made "the reiterated requests," &c., to have the cases decided; but in P. 1061, he says he made them to the "Secretaries." I certainly have no recollection whatever of having heard of any requests, or offers, of the nature alluded to; and yet, as I was on terms of intimacy with him, and as I do not gather from anything that he has written that he had at that time any suspicion that I would befriend Nursoo Punt, I cannot understand why the said requests were not made known to me. Col.
1405. Outram says (par. 32) that he urged on one of the members of the Government the annulment of the guarantee to Huree Bhugtee's firm. I conclude that one to have been Mr. Willoughby, and that he does not intend it to be understood that he ever spoke to me on the subject. I can readily account for his so speaking to Mr. Willoughby, who was his most intimate friend. He knew him to be fully conversant with all political matters relating to

Goozurat, with which he likewise knew that I had no personal or practical acquaintance.

I must add that I cannot understand on what principle of justice your correspondent can uphold Col. Outram's claim to the right of using his personal influence with Secretaries and members of the Government in any case after he had made his official report upon it, (a mode of proceeding to which I observe he was constantly in the habit of resorting,) and especially after he had, as in the present instance, given over his office to his assistant, when proceeding on a long leave of absence. Had any English officer, civil or military, been his antagonist, would such a proceeding have been tolerated? Why should it be so when natives, who are entitled to at least equal justice, are concerned? The proper answer to his representations would have been, that, as he had doubtless made the cases as perfect as he could, they would be decided on their merits; and that, if further information in regard to any point seemed to Government to be requisite, the acting Resident would be instructed to furnish it. It might have occurred to Col. Outram that on these occasions he was practising a species of the very "Khutput," which he has since been so earnest in denouncing. 1348. 1349.

To return to the Governor's minute on Pol's dispute with his banker; I may observe, that the case was disposed of on the information which Colonel Outram had laid before the Government. My present business is with that portion of the minute

which related to the conduct of Nursoo Punt. Col. Outram's letters at once shewed me that the affair was one of a very ordinary nature. It was simply a struggle, such as is constantly occurring in every office in India where natives are serving, for mastery. If the party in office have the apparent confidence of the head European officer, all goes on well and smoothly. If there is the slightest ground to believe that he has suspicion of his establishment; if he is credulous; especially if it be understood that he has preconceived notions on particular points, or for or against particular parties, which can be worked upon; efforts are made to turn these circumstances to account, till the result is either the dismissal of the principal natives, or their firmer retention of office. I appeal to every man conversant with Indian official life for a confirmation of these views. They are well known to the supreme and local Governments in India, and to the Court of Directors, who have often had occasion to notice them, in terms of caution and advice, in their communications to the authorities subordinate to them.

Seeing, then, the name of Nursoo Punt implicated in the transactions to which the letters related; aware of the high character which he had previously held; feeling that nothing would justify me in placing implicit reliance on the conclusions of Col. Outram, or any one else, in a matter of this nature; and observing, moreover, that the very man employed, in supersession of Nursoo Punt, to enquire into one of the cases, was the man proposed

as his successor; I deemed it my bounden duty to enter into a careful scrutiny of all that was laid before Government; I did so as I would have gone into a judicial case. The result was entirely exculpatory of Nursoo Punt; and it established in my mind a conviction that this was an attempt to make him the victim of an ordinary party struggle, in which Furké had succeeded in involving Col. Outram.

Of Furké (as I have said above,) I knew nothing beyond what Col. Outram had mentioned, namely, that he had formerly been native agent in the Rewa Kanta, but was "not now in Government employ." Why he was not then in employ, it did not occur to me to enquire. Col. Outram had an opportunity of informing Government of every particular respecting his protegé when he recommended him in his letter of the 9th September 1848, to succeed Nursoo Punt as native agent; and on such an occasion, he was bound to state all he knew, good or ill, respecting him, so as to guide Government in its decision. In par. 42 *et seq.* of his Khutput Report, Part II. 1389.
Sec. II., he tells us that when he joined at Baroda in May 1847, he was fully aware of Furké's having been "dismissed from Government employ on ac-
"count of his misconduct;" and of the Government having in the letter of the 20th March 1844, declared him unfit for political employ; and that it was only when he desired his assistance in "a very intricate and long pending case," that he discovered 1390.
"that the prohibition against his reemployment had
"been virtually annulled by the permission granted

"to him on the 5th July 1847 to apply to the "local authorities on the occurrence of a vacancy."

1390. Whether this letter of the 5th July 1847 to Furké will bear the construction which Col. Outram places upon it,—whether it was only the ordinary answer given by Government to every application for employment,—or whether it was given after a full consideration of the facts which had led to the declaration of Furké's ineligibility, and with a design of removing it,—and whether a corresponding communication was made to the "local authorities," (of whom the Baroda Resident would have been one) cannot (that I have discovered) be seen from what Col. Outram has told us in the Blue Book. It is clear, however, that Col. Outram knew regarding Furké everything that could be known, and that he did not communicate his knowledge to the Government on an occasion when it was most essentially his duty to do so. I will ask, what would Col. Outram have said if Nursoo Punt, in recommending any man to him for official employment, had omitted to state facts which he knew—injuriously, though in his opinion unjustly—affecting his character?

Chap. II. col. II. Your correspondent speaks of Furké's application for the office of native agent having been been refused in 1843, as if this had been an act of the Government. The nomination to the office rested with the Resident, and the Government, if it approved, confirmed the nomination. I cannot find that Mr. Boyd, the then Resident, ever nominated Furké, and that the Government refused

its confirmation. Mr. Boyd recommended Nursoo Punt on 4th December 1843. Government assented to the nomination on 14th December 1843. Colonel Outram tells us that Furké applied to Government for the "then vacant situation" on the 27th December 1843, that is, after Nursoo Punt's nomination had been confirmed! His application ended in an enquiry, the result of which was that Furké was declared "a very unfit person to be employed in any political capacity," on the 20th March 1844. Surely these facts cannot, with any justice, be perverted into an accusation against the Government for having refused to appoint Furké. For my own part, as I entered Council only in March 1844, and had no previous concern with this case, I hold myself perfectly free from any share in the disposal of it on Mr. Remington's letter of the 20th February 1844.

944. 1384. 1384.

I next come to the petition under a feigned name, which your correspondent says the Bombay Government received from Baroda against Nursoo Punt, "only two days after his (Colonel Outram's) departure for Egypt." Colonel Outram left for Egypt by the steamer Victoria on the 2nd of November 1848. In par. 47 of Sec. III. Part II. of his Khutput Report, he states (erroneously) that this petition was received by the Government on the 5th Nov. 1848. This is, I presume, the authority for your correspondent's assertion. Had he taken the pains to consult other parts of the book, he would have found the correct date, in p. 951, where the petition

Chap. II. col. 3. 1048.

itself is given;—in the Chief Secretary's memo-
1243. randum of the 27th August 1850;—and in a note by Colonel Outram, in the same page—as the 25th, and not the 5th November, which latter is, I hope, merely a misprint in p. 1408.

All petitions in the native languages are received in the first instance in the office of the deputy Secretary in the Persian department. They are there translated. Those requiring to come before Government for consideration are sent to the Secretary of the department to which they relate, by whom they are brought before the Board, or at once sent to the officers in the interior, to be reported upon.

The petition in question, then, was received in the
1243. office of the Persian (or deputy) Secretary on the 25th of November 1848,—was there translated and sent to the political Secretary on the 20th December 1848, and by him laid before the governor on the 21st. The Governor minuted on it on the 28th December 1848 (the date of his minute on Colonel Outram's letter of 7th September 1848.) It must have reached me on the same, or the next day, and been passed on at once to Mr. Willoughby, for his minute is dated the 31st December 1848.

The foregoing statement clearly proves that the Bombay Government, that is, the Governor and his Council, could have known nothing of this petition
1243. before the 21st December 1848 at the earliest, that
Vide page 47, of this letter. is *forty nine* days, instead of *two* days, after Colonel Outram had gone to Egypt, and sixteen days after

the date (the 5th December 1848) of the final resolution of Government in the case of Govindrao Guikwar. This is an ample proof of the extreme accuracy of your industrious correspondent.

The petition itself is found in p. 951 of the Blue Book. It bears no date. Its very substance at once proclaimed it to be fictitious, as it finally proved to be. It would be monstrous if the Government ever placed the smallest reliance on such petitions, so as to allow them to influence its decisions. The petition bore a signature, and therefore was sent to the acting Resident on the 4th January 1849, 1423.
in order that he might ascertain whether it came bonâ fide from the party whose name it bore. Captain French reported on the 9th January 1849, that no such person was known at Baroda, and the petition was in consequence filed, under a minute of the 16th January 1849.

I am prepared to join issue with Col. Outram on the subject of anonymous petitions. (Khutput Report, 1410.
Part II. Sec. III. par. 49.) I have always contended, and still contend, that they ought to be treated with contempt. They are, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the offspring of unsuccessful rivalry, malignant cowardice, disappointed roguery, or personal hatred; and should be allowed to cast no stain or suspicion on the characters of those attacked in them. I have had sufficient experience of official life in India, during thirty-two years, to know that if the authorities were to give the least encouragement to such representations, the wheels of Government would soon become completely clogged.

So far as the petition concerned me personally, I deemed it utterly unworthy of notice; notwithstanding the just appreciation of my character at which the writer had arrived. I placed no faith in anything it contained as to Nursoo Punt's sayings and doings, and their effect at Baroda. I believed, and still believe, the whole to be a complete fabrication, and to have its origin, if not in Furké himself, at least in one of his faction. I observe that when a fictitious petition was sent from Baroda against Furké, Col. Outram has no hesitation in stating it to have been dispatched "by one of Nursoo's friends." I claim an equal right to attribute this petition to Furké, and his allies.

"Mr. Reid will "not stain his "character for up- "rightness, known "throughout In- "dia."—Page 951. —Fas est et ab hoste doceri.

1410.

Vide page 31 of this letter.

I have explained above, that on the 7th October 1848, the Governor had recorded an opinion, that Nursoo Punt should be allowed to withdraw his resignation (though this was not communicated to the acting Resident until the cases of Govindrao Guikwar and Guorojee Pol were disposed of), and that, in his minute of the 20th November 1848, the Governor had referred to his civil colleagues the question of withdrawing the guarantee from Huree Bhugtee's firm. This minute, doubtless, had been copied in the Secretary's office, after its preparation by the Chief Secretary; so that there was ample time, and ample matter before the accomplice in the secretariat who communicated all that transpired in the department to Baroda, to enable the

Vide page 27 of this letter.

petitioner to frame and dispatch his petition, having for its object to poison my mind, and those of my colleagues, against Nursoo Punt, and to induce us to recommend the withdrawal of the guarantee from the firm.

The story told in this petition of Nursoo Punt's having sent me "a memorandum of Kulmbundee, &c.," is utterly false. I do not recollect having had, throughout the whole of these proceedings, the slightest correspondence with, or communication from him, either directly or indirectly, and it is my belief that a short note which Mr. Williamson Ramsay recently (on the 29th December 1852), delivered to me from him,—in which he briefly tells me that he has forwarded a memorial to the Hon. Court of Directors (which, however, I have not seen,)—is the first letter I have received from him, since I committed the unpardonable offence (in his rival Furké's eyes) of preventing his been driven from his office unjustly. Writing as I do, on a matter which occurred more than four years ago,—which then I deemed one of the most ordinary nature,—and which has now only acquired an importance by being mixed up in discussions fomented, if not created, by disappointed ambition, wounded vanity, inordinate self-opinion, honest though perverted views, and other motives,—some good some bad, as the part of each agent in them is considered,—I may be liable to error, and I must claim a latitude in my disavowments? Indeed had I seen Nursoo Punt, or any one interested in him, after I had

made up my mind that in the only two accusatory letters which I had seen from Colonel Outram, there were no just causes of complaint established against him, I should not have had the least hesitation in mentioning to him my opinion. There was then no particular call for secrecy, and I cannot doubt, therefore, that whether from my minutes, or from what might have fallen from me in conversation, my sentiments were not long concealed.

The mention in this petition of Baba Nafré and Huree Bhugtee's widow is, I may observe, in advance of Col. Outram's information at that time; for until after his return from Egypt, long after I left India, he never informed the Government that he had any suspicion of any grievous wrong having been inflicted on this lady; and if this case (Jethabaee's) was not previously brought in a proper
404. manner before the Government, Col. Outram himself is to blame.

I cannot avoid drawing attention to the subsequent history of this petition. Nearly two years after its receipt, when Nursoo Punt's enemies were recommencing their attack upon him, after
950. 1243. Colonel Outram's return to Baroda, the Resident reported on the 7th September 1850 that Jeyrow Hybutrow, a man "bearing a notoriously bad character," had come forward to declare himself its author. He mentioned him as an avowed enemy of
957. Nursoo Punt, but omitted the fact (which was ascertained from other quarters, and which his informants must have known) that this Jeyrow had been in the

Government service, had been dismissed, and declared incapable of re-employment; and that, since his dismissal, various other of his malpractices had been discovered. On the 11th July 1850 Colonel Outram took this man's deposition; and—in answer to a question whether any one was present when Nursoo Punt had said that Mr. Reid, the councillor, was a friend of his, &c.—he elicited the reply, "There "were four persons present, two Banians and two "Brahmins, who live in Baroda. If I saw them I "should recognize them." No further inquiry was then made, and the man returned to his village. "Two or three days after," it seems to have been suggested to Col. Outram (a sufficient time having elapsed to enable Jeyrow and his friends to find out two Banians and two Brahmins, and tutor them to their purpose), to resume the investigation; but being told that Jeyrow had left Baroda, and "not wishing unnecessarily to harass the man," the Resident deferred the enquiry, and we hear nothing more till the 31st August 1850, when Jeyrow again appeared upon the scene. He was again interrogated. He deposed that, having been a week previously at the Residency on some other business, he had been told to produce his witnesses; that he then returned to his village, and on again coming back to Baroda, on the 29th August 1850, he "saw two, whom he followed to ascertain their houses;" that he desired them to come to the Residency; that they declined; that he informed the native agent, Soorujram, who, "after informing the Resident," gave him a peon, to

952, mem. H.

whom he showed the houses of the two witnesses; that one, a Brahmin, came with them to the Residency; that the other, a Banian, promised to do so on the morrow; that he did not know the names of the witnesses, "by seeing them only could I make them out;" that he knew the second Brahmin by sight, and also the second Banian, whose house he had
953. found out. Next comes the examination of the first Brahmin witness, commencing with a leading question instructing him at once, even had he not been previously tutored, as to the answer required from him, and for which Colonel Outram is con-
954. strained to make an apology (*vide* note appended to this man's deposition). He of course deposed to all that was wanted. On the 2nd, 4th, and 6th September, we have the evidence of the three remaining witnesses; all certifying, with wonderful similarity, facts which occurred nearly two years back; all their statements being taken down by one and the same karkoon (clerk) (*vide* Col. Outram's
1063. statement of facts of 6th April 1851 par. 47), and, if we may judge from the explanation given by
954. Colonel Outram in the note above alluded to, taken perhaps in the presence of the Resident, but while that officer was "otherwise engaged."

Will any one pretend to say that this was an honest and fair enquiry? Yet Col. Outram believes it so; thinks it impossible there could have been any
950. collusion, and treats the whole case as most satisfactorily proved! By unprejudiced parties this can be viewed only as a convincing proof of the little

difficulty that Furké and his friends (Soorujram, the native agent, being of the number,) must have experienced, in inducing the Resident to believe anything; and a question will necessarily arise in their minds, how far, if all Col. Outram's investigations have been carried on in a similar spirit, they are to be depended on. The Government, as might be expected, at once declined to take any steps in such a matter, for which proceeding they are severely censured in the "Statement of Facts" of the 6th of April 1851, par. 47. 1063.

Your correspondent goes on to say, "Moreover, "some twenty days after the receipt of this docu- "ment, and some other twenty days before its "transmission to Baroda, Government had solemnly "ignored a charge of forgery, well supported by "proof, which had been preferred by the now "absent Col. Outram against the very Baba Nafra, "whom his relative Nursoo Punt had boasted, "according to the petition, of screening from more "punishment." I have already shown, Chap. II, col. 3.

First,—That on the 5th December, 1848, that is, *sixteen days before*, and not *some twenty days after* the receipt of this document, the Government decided the case of Govindrao Guikwar, and on the 15th December, 1848, that is, *six days before* such receipt, communicated that decision to the acting Resident.

Secondly,—That the Government did not, in that case, solemnly ignore a charge of forgery

well supported by proof. The most that Colonel Outram himself has ever tried to make of this case, even when his feelings had been excited to the utmost after his return
1406. from Egypt, is to call it a charge of "constructive forgery;" and though the Court of
32. Directors, in their letter of the 13th February 1850, differed in opinion from the Government, so far as to think that the substitution of one bond for the other would, if proved, be an offence which ought to involve the withdrawal of the guarantee—yet, in directing that further investigation should be made, they specially observed that "the "case was not brought very clearly before "Government in Col. Outram's letter."

Thirdly,—That Baba Nafra was not at that time known, and had never been described by Col. Outram, as a relative of Nursoo Punt; and that the Government was, at the time when this case was decided, ignorant that it had ever been alleged, whether truly or falsely, against Nursoo Punt, that he had made the boast attributed to him.

I now come to the "Maurrice" letter bearing date the 3rd January 1849. Mr. J. Morris never was my confidential clerk. I never had a confidential clerk, or private clerk of any kind. Whilst Revenue Secretary, in any confidential business, I employed the head clerks,—Mr. Blowers, now deputy Postmaster General, and Mr. F. Hutchinson, now

Collector of Bombay,—and them only. Whilst in Council, I recorded my minutes in my own handwriting; or had them transcribed from my rough-drafts, by a copyist of the Secretariat.

But I need scarcely do more on this point, than refer you to Col. Outram's own words, (par. 34 of his Statement of Facts of 6th April 1851) where he observes, speaking of Mr. Morris, "who I had been 1060.
"told, though I now find erroneously, was a private "clerk or secretary to Mr. Reid." I conclude Furké or some of his party had told him so. He might have learned from this that such authority was not always sure. However, the poison did its work. He had once stated the fact of Mr. Morris being my private clerk, and (as in the case of your correspondent) few would take the trouble to search for a disavowal, and, moreover, subsequently to his knowledge that Mr. Morris was not my confidential clerk, he alludes to him as in that capacity.

I believe Mr. Morris was, many years back, in the Revenue department of the secretariat, before he entered the office of the Revenue Commissioner. He was then appointed uncovenanted assistant to the Register of the Sudr Adalut. I was, ex officio, Chief Judge of that Court, but, under its constitution, I had no judicial functions to perform, except in cases of very rare occurrence, wherein the puisne Judges required the attendance of the Chief Judge on any difference of opinion which could not otherwise be adjusted. I had no concern whatever with

the appointment of the subordinate officers of the Court; and I never interfered, either publicly or privately, in order to obtain the office of assistant Register for Mr. Morris, of whom, personally, I knew nothing.

I find no allusion to the "Maurrice" letter by Col. Outram in any part of the Blue Book before his
1060. "Statement of Facts" of 6th April 1851, par. 34. Copy of the letter is there given, signed "J. R. Morris." The original letter we find signed, "J. R. Maurrice." The object of the copyist from whom Col. Outram obtained the document, in thus falsifying the signature, must be left to conjecture. Nothing could be found in such falsification criminatory of Nursoo Punt, and, therefore, this point is passed over by him in silence.

In par. 15 of Appendix A. to Part II. of the
1485. Khutput Report we find an account of how this copy was obtained. Col. Outram there says, "in "my Statement of Facts" relative to Nursoo Punt, "which was dispatched from Baroda on the 10th
This should be 1851. "of April 1850, I reproduced the letter under "notice, a copy of it having been placed in my "hands by an individual to whom Nursoo had "caused it to be submitted, knowing him to be a "friend of Baba Fudkeys." He says *re*produced; but I cannot find on what previous occasion he had produced it.

1272. Again in his letter of 29th April 1851 to Mr. Malet Col. Outram states, "I have not the original

"of the letter referred to; a copy only had been
"taken by a person at Baroda, to whom Nursoo
"Punt had shown it, as he did to several, with the
"view, I suppose, to discourage his enemies, and
"especially the author of the anonymous petition,
"(received from Government at the same time by
"Capt. French,) from appearing against him, as
"indeed it effectually did. Dreading as the people
"of Baroda do, Nursoo Punt's power and influence,
"the party who furnished the copy would of course
"rather not come forward, but, if absolutely neces-
"sary, he is ready to substantiate the fact of having
"made the copy from the original, and that the
"original was shown to him, as well as to others, by
"Nursoo Punt."

Doubtless Furké, or Furké's intimate friend—the 1023.
copyist, who falsified the signature—was the party who falsely informed Colonel Outram that Mr. Morris was my confidential clerk.

It is a singular fact that when Colonel Outram, on the 7th September 1850, sent his two letters to Government, No. 207 A., and No. 207 B.—the first, 960.
re-opening the cases of Govindrao Guikwar, and Guorojee Pol; the second, regarding the anonymous 950.
petition, the authorship of which Hybutrow came forward to claim;—he says nothing of the "Maurice" letter, which would have strengthened greatly the point he desired to establish, and which, he would lead us to believe, was known throughout Baroda since January 1849! The only reasonable conclusion from this silence is, either that Furké had

concealed from Colonel Outram the existence of
1023. this letter, (although Muncherjee, his intimate friend, had seen, and made a copy of it, about the latter date); or that the story about Nursoo Punt's having paraded it, and Muncherjee's having copied it, is untrue. That the copy was in Colonel Outram's hands on the 11th January 1851, is stated by him
1414. in his Khutput Report, Part II. Sec. III. par. 69. He had it, therefore, at least three months in his possession before he communicated his knowledge of it to Government.

The letter bears date the 3rd January 1849, and has the Bombay post-mark of the 4th. Nursoo Punt must have received it on the 7th January 1849. He never answered it. His son Keshow came to Bombay in March 1849. He then spoke to Mr. Morris on the subject. Mr. Morris denied the authorship, and desired to see the original letter in order to discover the writer. Keshow sent him the original letter from Bansda on the 20th June 1849.
1045. Mr. Morris produced it to Mr. Thomas, Mr. Rouget,
1083. and Mr. Showell, the head clerks of the political, judicial, and revenue departments. Mr. Thomas
1047. laid it immediately before the Chief Secretary. Enquiry was instituted, but the writer remained undiscovered.

Colonel Outram, (vide par. 27th of his supple-
1453. mentary Khutput Report of the 13th January 1852,
1488. and the Appendix) makes a strong accusation against the subordinates of the secretariat for not having brought forward the case of this letter, as soon as it

became known to them. A reference to the pages I have above cited will show that his accusation is entirely groundless. The letter was shown to Mr. Malet, the Chief Secretary, in the monsoon of 1849, (*vide* Mr. Thomas' statement.) Mr. Malet states, 1048.
"as soon as the letter was received, enquiries were
"set on foot to discover the author." Mr. Thomas 1045.
"in vain endeavoured to trace likeness in the
"writing to any in the political branch of the
"secretariat, and the other assistants were equally
"unsuccessful in the departments to which they
"belonged." It is to be regretted that the matter was not then laid before the Council Board. Still, had it been so, it is probable that the result would have been merely to record the facts of the Chief Secretary's unsuccessful enquiries. It must be remembered that in the monsoon of 1849 there was no agitation, such as has subsequently arisen, and this would have been considered one of those cases (of which I am sorry to say there never has been a want of instances) wherein the proceedings of the Government had improperly transpired, without any clue being found to the delinquent.

Col. Outram has not, in any part of the Blue Book that I can discover, succeeded in showing that Nursoo Punt was convinced that Mr. Morris was the writer of this letter, or that it was a communication from Mr. Reid. Had he so believed, why was the letter not answered at once? If any thing was to be done by Mr. Reid, no time was

to be lost; for Nursoo Punt well knew that Mr. Reid was to proceed to England in March. And why did he take no steps whatever till his son Keshow visited Bombay about that period? and even then, none which showed that he entertained such an impression?

And in regard to Mr. Morris's complicity in this matter it is to be observed that, in March 1849 nothing had been discovered; no investigation was going on; Nursoo Punt had apparently gained his object; he was in favour with the acting Resident. The same state of things existed in June 1849. Why, then, should Mr. Morris, if the author of the letter, have hesitated to declare himself, and to claim his reward for the service he had rendered, instead of voluntarily (for there is nothing to show that he was driven by circumstances to this course) laying the original letter before the head clerks of the secretariat, and, through them, before the Chief Secretary?

In any unbiassed mind there cannot be a doubt that, by whomsoever this letter was written, Nursoo Punt—who had never in his life received a communication from me—was, from the first, perfectly satisfied that the communication did not come from Mr. Reid, and that Mr. Morris was not the writer; and that, whatever use he may have made of the letter, (and this is a point resting, so far as I can discover, on very doubtful testimony) he knew no more than that it was sent by either an unknown friend, or an unknown enemy.

I commence my remarks on the letter itself, by distinctly and peremptorily declaring, that I never caused any communication to be made to Nursoo Punt; and that I know nothing whatever of the letter in question—notwithstanding Col. Outram's insinuation in paragraph 53 of his Khutput Report, Part II. Sec. 3, which can scarcely bear any other construction than that I must have been cognizant of the transaction; a view which is directly at variance with the whole tenor of his usual observations, and particularly with his remarks in para. 5 of his letter of the 11th November 1851, in which he distinctly cites the "Maurrice" letter, not as a proof of my having communicated with Nursoo Punt, but as a strong instance of the corruption of the secretariat. 1411 1146.

The letter is dated the 3rd January 1849. The decision of Government on Nursoo Punt's application to retire, which he was permitted to withdraw, is found in the Governor's minute, signed by Mr. Reid and Mr. Willoughby, of the 7th October, 1848. The whole proceedings of the Government in the cases of Govindrao Guikwar and Guorojee Pol were completed by Mr. Willoughby's minute on the latter, of the 31st December 1848, when, or immediately after which date, the papers returned to the secretariat. The "Maurrice" letter must have been written after Mr. Willoughby's minute, because it contained matter not to be found in the Governor's, and my minute of the 28th December. I allude to the reference made to Furké, as "not 1245.

"being allowed to have anything to do with Go-
"vernment business,"—for this is to be found in Mr. Willoughby's minute only. It is clear, then, that the secretariat was in possession on, or immediately after, the 31st December 1848—and that no one could have been in possession before,—of all the information which enabled some person in the office to write the letter, or to cause it to be written.

1109. 1110. 1160. And when we find that the actual minutes of the members of the Government are freely communicated to those who will pay for them, are we to wonder that such a communication as the "Maurrice" letter should find its way from the secretariat; and to think that it could not have been sent without the privity of a member of the Government?

Suspicion attaches to a Mr. Craig, then a clerk in the political department, whom your accurate correspondent describes as "now a collector or "magistrate in the Mofussil." He would, had he taken the trouble to search, have found this man's history in pages 1045, 1083, 1240, 1266, and 1272, and probably in many other places; and he would have learnt, that instead of being "now a collector or magistrate in the Mofussil," he is a denounced fugitive; that he quitted Bombay on leave of absence on the 12th February 1849; that he has not since returned; and that the efforts of the Bombay Government to obtain intelligence respecting him from the other presidencies have failed. He had previously borne a high character, and Mr.

Chap. II. Col. 4.

Thomas, the head clerk, seems, from the account which he gives of him in his memorandum of the 19th January 1852, to have placed the greatest confidence in him. 1272.

I confirm Mr. Thomas' statement, and the remark in par. 6 of the Committee's Report, that Mr. Craig was not personally known to me. He never to my knowledge was at my house; or had any employment under me, or the slightest intercourse with me. I cannot say I never saw him; because, as he was in the Secretary's office from October 1838, and I was at the head of the same office, though in a different department, till March 1844, he must have passed some time or other before me; but I am not aware that I ever spoke to him in my life. It is surmised—and, considering what has since transpired, with some probability,—that he was the author of the anonymous letters sent to Mr. Willoughby and myself in April 1848. 1272. 1261.

In addition to imparting information from the minutes of Council, of the communication to be made to the acting Resident regarding Nursoo Punt, the "Maurrice" letter goes on to warn Nursoo Punt against enmity to Baba Nafra, and Huree Bhugtee's firm. This your correspondent terms "a figment of "the Bombay Government and its European under-"lings." From what part of the Blue Book he obtains this impression, I have not discovered. But it is difficult to comprehend why, if Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra were in alliance, and if the letter were the production of a friend of the

former—of one who knew his tactics, and whose object was merely to communicate intelligence which might be of use to him—any such allusion was made.

Col. Outram assumes, in many parts of his proceedings, a *simulated* hostility between Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafré. But so far as I can discover, this is a mere assumption; and it is opposed by two facts which at this moment occur to me; first, that in the case of Govindrao Guikwar, instead of supporting Baba Nafra's claim to the exorbitant sum of above three lacs of rupees, Nursoo Punt suggested a mode of settlement by which the firm was to receive even a smaller sum than Col. Outram awarded; and secondly, that Capt. French, whom Col. Outram describes as a mere tool in his native agent's hands,
350. recommended to Government the entire withdrawal
410. of the British guarantee. These facts are irreconcileable with simulated hostility and real friendship, and, in truth, are to be accounted for only on what it is not in every man's nature to admit to an opponent, viz. a right sense of duty. But, having disclaimed all knowledge of the letter, it is needless for me to pursue this part of the subject, or to do more than state that, till I saw the Blue Book, I never had an insight into the state of parties at Baroda, and therefore, had no knowledge of what individuals were friends or enemies of each other.

There is one mystery in this "Maurrice" letter which I am quite unable to unravel, consistently

with the assumption that it was written by a friend of Nursoo Punt. I allude to the directions given to send the answer "by post" to "Mr. J. R. Maurrice, "at Mr. Reid's house, Bombay." Such instructions involved either a probability of the answer never reaching its destination, or a certainty of discovery. All letters coming to my house from the post office were delivered to my peons, none of whom could read English, and by them to me. Had a letter so addressed been brought to me, I should, having nothing to excite my suspicions, have simply returned it to the post office as a misdirected letter. It would have lain in the dead letter office, until claimed by some party interested. If, on the other hand, any thing had occurred to raise my suspicions, I might have deemed it right to open the letter; when the intrigue would at once have been discovered. Col. Outram disposes summarily of this view of the question by saying that, "to suppose 1411.
"that the letter was written out of enmity to Nursoo "is simply absurd." He seems to have found it difficult to admit a view which would have told so much in favour of an opponent. He knows, in his heart, that I had no more to do with the "Maurrice" letter than he had himself. How then can he reconcile the directions given as to the address, with the assumption that they were given by a friend of Nursoo Punt? And has he not had sufficient experience of Indian intrigue to have learnt, that there is no artifice, however deep, to which a wily Brahmin (a class

to which Furké, as well as Nursoo Punt belongs, and whose character he himself well describes in p. 965,) will not resort in order to gain his object? And what would have been more damning to Nursoo Punt's character than the discovery that he had answered a communication, such as the "Maurrice" letter, in such a way as to show a disposition to enter into a base intrigue?

I do not contend that Nursoo Punt acted as he ought to have done in respect to this letter. It was his duty, the instant he received it, to have laid it before the acting Resident, or to have sent it to me. His having adopted neither of these courses exposes him to the imputation of not possessing that honesty and straightforwardness which his long intercourse with English gentlemen of honour and education ought to have instilled into him. I am surprised to find that when, in the monsoon of 1849, the "Maurrice" letter was laid before the Chief Secretary, Nursoo Punt was not asked for an explanation of his motive in so long concealing it; and, when making it known at all, doing so by referring only to Mr. Morris, instead of to the superiors of his own department. His conduct on this occasion affords an apt illustration of native character.

To proceed with the paragraph of your correspondent's Chapter II, subsequent to the citation of the "Maurrice" letter,—I will briefly show that it contains a mass of misrepresentation and unfair deductions. I have explained that the direction given as to the address would not have insured the

delivery of the answer to Mr. Morris; that no answer was ever sent; that Mr. Morris did not see the letter itself before June 1849, after I had left India; that Mr. Morris could not, therefore, have laid either the letter itself, or a reply which never existed, before Mr. Reid; that Nursoo Punt could not have "believed in its genuineness," or he would have answered it, and otherwise obeyed its injunctions; that the Bombay Governor and Council never heard of this letter till Col. Outram brought it to their notice on the 6th April 1851, two years after 1060.
I had left India; that they never "knew it to be genuine;" that they did not "decline all investigation at the moment," but made such inquiry as was in their power; and that the Chief Secretary, before whom the letter was laid in the monsoon of 1849, then made inquiry into it. I will further remark that the writer does not instruct Nursoo Punt, as your correspondent states, to conceal the letter "from his superiors at the Residency;" that he enjoined entire secrecy; that Nursoo Punt at once (so Col. Outram asserts) broke this injunction, by shewing it to his very enemies—thereby taking the most effectual means for publishing to all the world what he had been directed to keep secret; that Colonel Outram's favourite, Furké (if Colonel Outram's assumption be correct) knew of the existence of this letter from the first; that he did not mention it to his patron, till January 1851, thus keeping it 1414.
secret for two years during which he was in communication with Col. Outram; that Col. Outram has

nowhere explained why he did not inform Government for three months,—or Furké, why he did not inform Col. Outram, or Lieut. Battye, or any European authority, for two years,—after each became acquainted with the existence of the letter; that it is false that any "menaces of disclosure" forced the Government "to make some show of anxiety;" that the committee "with Mr. Secretary Malet in the chair" sat on a totally different subject of inquiry,
1260. and that neither in the report of that committee, nor in the daily record of its proceedings, nor in the minutes of the members of the Government upon it, is the "Maurrice" letter once alluded to. So much for your correspondent's truthfulness, fairness of argument, and accuracy of research.

Your correspondent goes on, "If we are asked "what interest had Mr. Reid or Mr. Willoughby, "or any other European gentleman, in procuring "'secret friendship' with Nursoo Punt, we frankly "say that we know not;" and then proceeds to insinuate that that interest was nothing more nor less than corruption; that money had been sent to Bombay by Baba Nafra for the purpose of securing that friendship, &c., &c.

I have above fully explained my own part in interfering (in the only case I ever did so) in supporting Nursoo Punt against what I then deemed (and a careful perusal of everything relating to this point has in no way altered my opinion) unjust treatment. I cannot assent to Col. Outram's view,—which gives a color to his correspondence throughout

page after page of the Blue Book,—that it was the sole duty of the Bombay Government to carry out his wishes and obey his suggestions to the letter; and that it was a crime to hesitate to act as he desired, even if his desires might seem opposed to all law and justice. I had no reliance on his infallibility; and believed it my duty to weigh every case which he thought fit to lay before the Government, as I would those of any other subordinate officer. I had seen many similar cases wherein native servants had been ruined by cabals fostered by the credulity, prejudice, want of temper and discretion of European officers; and (as I have already stated) there was nothing apparent, at the time, to lead to the belief that this was other than an ordinary case of this nature; differing in fact from others only in that the native officer, whose conduct formed the subject of discussion, was a man hitherto of extraordinarily high character. By my imputed interference in this case, and my not consenting to leave Furké in undisputed sovereignty over Baroda affairs when Col. Outram proceeded to Egypt (though, in fact, I had no more concern in this than any other member of the Government), I have drawn down upon myself the enmity of a strong and violent party, who have not hesitated, *in my absence*, to resort to all means short of actual accusation of corruption, including appeals to the local press, to cast a slur upon my character.

The base insinuation respecting money sent from Baroda requires but little comment. A proper

distinction is drawn, throughout the Blue Book, which your correspondent cannot or will not discover (as I have on a former occasion observed,) between an attempt to bribe, and the obtaining money under the false pretence of bribing; both equally criminal in the parties prepared to bribe; but differing in respect to the other party, inasmuch as, in the one case, he must be cognizant of an attempt, while in the other he may ever remain in ignorance of even the design. If such design ever existed in reference to myself, it is no more than
1167. existed in reference to Mr. Willoughby, Mr. Malet, Col. Outram himself and others. Our characters will, I trust, defend us from any imputation of criminality because natives are corrupt; and we must be content with lamenting that our purity could not protect us from the belief, even among the dupes of the corruptionists at Baroda, that any English gentlemen, holding the high positions that we did, could be corrupted. I will quote one sentence from Colonel Outram's favorite anonymous
951. petition, which, so far as I am concerned, shows that my name did not always stand low in that sink of iniquity;—"Mr. Reid will not stain his character "for uprightness, known throughout India, &c. &c."

1444. Col. Outram's account (Khutput Report. Part II. Sec. VI.) of the conduct, before Mr. Frere's commission, of the only witness who declared that he had seen me, viz. Joteshwur Eecharam, is characteristic. "It was Joteshwur, the man who had "been sent by Baba Nafra to bribe Mr. Reid, and

" in the following year had been the confidential " bearer of a letter to Mr. Willoughby. He perjured " himself deliberately, &c." The evidence of this man, taken before Col. Outram, is a specimen of the mode of conducting such business at Baroda. There is no cross examination in order to ascertain whether he could ever have seen me at all (which of course he never did). He might have been questioned as to the date on which he saw me; the place; my appearance; the language of conversation; and a hundred other particulars, which might at once,—and probably, if asked at the time, would at once,—have proved either that his whole story was a fabrication, or that he had been deceived. Col. Outram must have been satisfied of the untruth of this man's story in this particular, or he would have followed up his enquiries on the points I have noticed. If Furké, or his friends, drew up the examination, all that was wanted possibly was the mention of my name. That obtained, nothing beyond was sought for. Further questions would have broken down the witness' credibility.

It is more than probable that the mission to Bombay in 1848 had entirely in view to keep up that disgraceful connection with the political department of the Bombay secretariat, which we know has so long existed; (and, I have little doubt, does so at the present moment;—nay I would go farther, and express my belief that the same facility of obtaining information, where large sums are expended for the purpose, exists in all offices

throughout India,) and that the mention of my name in this matter was an afterthought, arising solely out of the hostile machinations of Furké's party; the knowledge which they had obtained that I, in the first instance, had opposed the displacement of Nursoo Punt in order to make room for Furké at the Residency; and the appearance of the "Maurrice" letter,—whether this was one of their own artifices, or whether, in reality, the communication of a friend to Nursoo Punt. No faith can be put in the after-statement of Moonims and Gomashtas, as to what were their objects at a former period. I believe that Furké, wielding the influence of the Resident, could have procured any such evidence that might have been desired.

In defending myself against the foul aspersions and false insinuations of my assailant, which are founded on an unscrupulous perversion of facts, and on a series of disgraceful falsehoods, I must be understood to advance no opinion, beyond what my defence requires, on the main questions treated in the Blue Book, with which I have no concern.

No one would attempt to deny the corruption of many of the subordinate officers of the political department of the Bombay secretariat, the recent disclosures in respect to which would justify the severest measures; the belief in "Khutput," which Col. Outram has striven, with so much zeal, to expose; the corruption of the Residency establishment; and the total absence of even the semblance of political morality in the Baroda court. But,

with my experience of the value of native evidence, and my knowledge of the native character, I should be sorry to have to give an opinion, on the papers before the public, as to the guilt of Nursoo Punt, or the innocence of Jethabaee.

Nursoo Punt *may be* the greatest villain that the corrupt soil of Baroda has ever generated; Baba Nafra *may be* in the same category; all their friends and supporters *may be* rightly placed in the same schedule; Jethabaee *may be* an injured angel; Furké, a persecuted saint. But when I consider the nature of the plots in the series of dramas presented to us—the characters of the performers, from His Highness the Guikwar and Col. Outram down to the lowest kolee—and the locality of the scene of action—I am constrained to the conclusion that the justice of the catastrophes has not yet been shown, and that the whole of the matters treated under such circumstances remain still involved in a deep shade of darkness and of doubt.

I cannot but regret the necessity, to which I have felt myself compelled, of making any remarks, even casually, on Col. Outram. His disavowal, in every part of the Blue Book, of all belief that my character for purity was in any degree compromised,—though anxious to prove that my name had been scandalously prostituted by a wicked party; his personal disclamation of a similar nature, when, on his return to England, he told me that "I ought to "be most thankful to him, for bringing to justice

" the scoundrels who had made so infamous an use " of my name;" his letter to Sir James Hogg, read by that gentleman in the House of Commons on the 23rd of April 1852, in which he distinctly declared that none of his proceedings could cast " imputations on the personal honour and integrity " of members of the Bombay government;" all incontestably prove, not only that he can have been no party to the disgraceful attack upon Mr. Willoughby and myself, which your pages have contained, but that he must view it with disgust and abhorrence. I know that such are his feelings.

But when I see that a reckless assailant, setting aside Col. Outram's views and opinions in this matter—arguing, (if it deserve the term) on a perversion of the facts which his narratives supply,—disregarding all reference to dates, all calculations of time, all facts which tell to the utter overthrow of his conclusions,—stringing together isolated expressions without reference to the context,—applying the facts of one case barefacedly to another, with which they have not the slightest connection,—and in truth, doing all that can be designated unfair, wicked, and dishonest,—strives to bring upon me unmerited disgrace in the eyes of my countrymen, I am compelled, in my own vindication, not only to expose the malice of my assailant, but to go further, and point out where Col. Outram and other parties, whose statements and opinions (however perverted) have been made the groundwork of attack, are

wrong in their facts, and mistaken in their conclusions; and, as far as lies in my power, to account for, and explain the causes of their errors. In this process a reference to personal character and feelings, which I hope I have in no instance carried beyond legitimate bounds, is unavoidable; and this must plead my excuse for the course which I have been constrained to adopt.

I address this letter to you, Sir, as the Editor of the Daily News, in no belief that you will do me justice, in retracting one word of your aspersions, or acknowledging the errors and malice of your correspondent. Such magnanimity might be too great, even for one who professes to be the friend of impartial discussion. Of all hatreds, the strongest is that based on a consciousness of having committed grievous injustice. You are, doubtless, well convinced that of the small minority of your readers who may at all regard articles relating to India, most will implicitly accept your account of volumes which it is obvious you have never read. Still, I trust, Sir, that some may be found, whom a sense of justice will dispose to examine for themselves. To their judgment I confidently commit my character, under no apprehension that it will suffer from what you have published to the world. A reputation which is founded on two and thirty years of laborious, successful, and unblemished public usefulness, is not to be tarnished by the excited and often unjustifiable expressions of a disappointed brother

officer, which have been distorted, for his own purposes, by a crafty and insidious enemy; one who may not "love to be despised," but who has successfully labored to be despicable.

I am, &c., &c.,
L. R. REID.

122, *Westbourne Terrace,*
10*th February*, 1853.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since writing the foregoing pages, I have seen a pamphlet, addressed to the Right Hon. Sir Charles Wood, M.P., President of the Board of Control, signed "Indus," and entitled "Bombay Briberies," which contains the substance of the "Chapters," on which I have been commenting, but with, if possible, a display of even greater scurrility and falsehood. Some kind friend of the writer has enabled him to correct several of the gross errors which I have pointed out; but not, apparently, to avoid falling into others of a similar nature. I believe that all the insinuations against myself, in which this pamphlet abounds, have been refuted by what I have already written. I shall not therefore, consume more of my own time in making further comments, or yours in perusing them. In one wish expressed by the writer I cordially join, viz: that the whole of the documents, in every case which has been adduced, had been published without reserve or suppression. But I have another wish, in which I cannot expect his concurrence, viz:

Vide page 21 of pamphlet.

that all who desire to form a right opinion of the merits of the questions discussed, will go with care and diligence through the Parliamentary papers; and place no reliance on the false assertions of an unprincipled and anonymous libeller, who is actuated either by personal malice (on his own part, or on that of others from whom he takes his instructions) or by an innately vicious inclination to slander honorable men.

T. R. R.

BARODA AND BOMBAY;

THEIR

POLITICAL MORALITY

A NARRATIVE

DRAWN FROM THE PAPERS LAID BEFORE PARLIAMENT IN RELATION TO THE

REMOVAL OF LIEUT.-COL. OUTRAM C.B.

FROM THE OFFICE OF

RESIDENT AT THE COURT OF THE GAEKWAR.

WITH

Explanatory Notes,

AND

REMARKS ON THE LETTER OF L. R. REID, ESQ.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

BY JOHN CHAPMAN,

AUTHOR OF "THE COTTON AND COMMERCE OF INDIA CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO GREAT BRITAIN."

LONDON:

JOHN CHAPMAN, 142, STRAND.

MDCCCLIII.

hrt 357 18095479
Chai/Bao

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WOODFALL AND KINDER,
ANGEL COURT, SKINNER STREET.

PREFACE.

THE following narrative is drawn from the documents comprised in the return made by the East India Company, to an order of the House of Commons, on the motion of Mr. Anstey, "of all Correspondence and Papers on the subject of Colonel Outram's removal from the office of Resident at the Court of the Guicowar; or on the subject of the alleged Corruption of Officers of the Bombay Government with bribes from Baroda."—(June 30, 1852, No. 560.)

The bulk of these Blue Books, 1514 folio pages, and, still more, the extraordinary misarrangement of their contents, render an abstract of some kind necessary to many who require to be acquainted with the complicated facts related in them. One instance of the confusion which prevails throughout must suffice to characterise the whole.

Part of the papers relating to the case of Nursoo Punt are contained in a "collection" which begins at page 944. We first come at page 960 to matters in serious discussion between the Bombay Government and Colonel Outram respecting this native officer; then at page 988 we have a mere note at the date of Colonel Outram's transmission to the Government of a "Statement of Facts" seriously inculpating him; then we have 65 folio pages of orders, proceedings, minutes, petitions, judgments, objections of Government and replies to them, and it is not until we have entered *on another collection of papers* that we find, at page 1054, the very important "Statement" which ought to have been given where the note of its transmission is placed, on which "Statement" all these discussions are founded, and without which a great part of them is unintelligible. The Government, however, thus stated their own case first, and involved the whole in perplexity. The

actual suppression of a highly important paper of this series will be found noticed in its proper place.

The papers appear to have been laid before Parliament, by the East India Directors, exactly as they came from the Government of Bombay. The only index given is useless until the book is almost known by heart.

Whether this universal disorder came of a routine unfit for practical uses, or of a desire to conceal in confusion that which feared the light, it is necessary that the intricacy be disentangled as well as that the mutual relations of the chief facts be exhibited. It was found that these objects could only be accomplished by means of a narrative, the incidents of which should be referred for authority to their singularly scattered places in the papers. References to original documents have been generally preferred where such were available, although Colonel Outram's several Reports frequently exhibit the same facts to the reader more conveniently; the latter, however, will be more easily found by each person for himself than the former. A single number in the margin refers to a page of the Blue Books; a second after it gives the paragraph, letter, note, or other division of the page, as may happen. The first or perhaps principal paragraph or letter is often alone referred to; the reader will follow on for himself as far as seems to be required.

Many of the notes and observations are intended to afford some such help as familiarity with Indian subjects would render unnecessary. The treatment of the whole subject, as well as the opinions expressed, are to be attributed to myself alone; although I am happy to have had such aid from Colonel Outram as has prevented, I trust, any serious misapprehension on my part, of important facts.

I am sorry that Mr. Reid's pamphlet, lately published, has compelled me to add a "Postscript" to my original design. The "Dissents of thirteen Directors of the East India Company" (part of the majority who agreed in them) became available for publication only at the last moment.

J. CHAPMAN.

March, 1853.

INDIAN POLITICAL MORALITY.

BARODA AND BOMBAY.

"KHUTPUT" is a word employed in some of the languages of India to denote active, toilsome, vexatious business; it is conventionally and most frequently used in the sense of endeavouring to accomplish private purposes by means of corrupt and hidden interest; chiefly bribery is understood.

Under the native Governments of India the practice of Khutput was universal and shameless. Where there is no elevated standard of morality, whether of authority or usage, and no constitutional security against wrong, the resort of men with purposes to accomplish in which the Government is concerned must commonly be to underhand arts. In a less advanced state of our own national morality and polity it was with us as it is now with them; although we now attach to these arts some measure of their due shame. The pressure and danger which give prevalence to this practice in the East under native rule, are so generally felt, that indigenous public opinion does not much censure those who employ it. Success, there even more than here, is held in most cases of moral obliquity to justify the means, and especially so in matters connected with Government or money-getting.

The rule of Britain in India is founded on moral in-

fluence. Eighty thousand Europeans, army included, cannot be imagined to keep in subjection 130,000,000 of people by means of physical strength. We rule simply because the natives of India believe they can trust us better than they can trust one another. Whatever injures the confidence of the natives in the integrity, impartiality, and good faith of our Government, weakens in the same degree the foundation of our rule.

This special reason for sternly repressing corruption in our Indian Government, is scarcely more imperative than that supplied by the evils which ever flow from the relaxation, perversion, and unfaithfulness of any system of administration in which clandestine private interests are suffered to mingle themselves with corporate or national objects; and those evils must reach their height in a country where few men hesitate to offer a bribe, and where the abuse of power is necessarily subject to comparatively feeble checks. The East India Company, taught by grievous experience, have long maintained the most stringent regulations, forbidding illicit advantages to their officers, in any form, under the most serious penalties.

21-*. On the 15th of May, 1850, the Government of Bombay issued a circular to its officers, desiring each of them to ascertain whether there existed within his district a general belief, or a belief entertained by particular classes, that improper designs could be promoted by "making Khutput in Bombay," *i. e.* by obtaining the secret and corrupt favour of men in power at that seat of Government.

On the part of the Government the issuing of such a circular at all was a singular step. Some of their most experienced officers had long before drawn their attention to the scandal; they had themselves loftily disdained to notice it; the unflinching determination of Sir George Arthur, then Governor, had brought to light most extensive intrigues of the foulest kind in 1842–3—only seven years before; and since that time two members of council had re-

1347-10. 1360-33.

1406-‡. ceived private intimations that it would be to their advantage to favour a certain wealthy establishment at Baroda, which will figure prominently in the following pages. What more could the Government want to satisfy them that, whatever they really were, the people believed them to be corrupt?

The ostensible occasion of the circular was the reception of certain reports from Mr. Albemarle Bettington, magistrate at Ahmedabad, and Mr. Hart, Enam Commissioner in the Southern Mahratta country, the two extremities of the Bombay presidency. These reports are not, but should be, before Parliament; little more is publicly known of them than that they so loudly complained of the difficulties occasioned by the general belief that Government could not slight them. Probably their effect was aided by the reiterated statements of Lieutenant-Colonel Outram, who was then at Bombay; this officer had long before and often represented to the Government that both their reputation and their measures had severely suffered from this belief at Baroda, where, at times, for fourteen years he had been intimately concerned in public affairs, and where he was then "the Resident," representing the British Government*. It became Colonel Outram's duty, in reply to the circular, to report on the subject in reference to the affairs of Baroda, the capital of the prince styled the Gaekwar; whose dominions, much intermingled with our own, form a great part of the division of India called Guzerat.

The circular of the Government adverted to a "belief," said to prevail "generally;"—to a belief "greatly embarrassing" to the Government and its officers, and "undermining the confidence of the ryots in the justice of the system under which they are governed." It also desired each officer to suggest measures which

* Under our peculiar engagements with most of the princes of India, "the Resident" has to take a part in the management of the country along with the Native Government, far exceeding any interference which is exercised by diplomatic agents in Europe, or which would be attempted by the boldest of them.

might appear to him calculated to eradicate this dishonouring belief.

The consequent report of Colonel Outram, dated 31st October, 1851, embraced a long period; for, to adduce a few passing facts or surmises would not have established the existence of a belief which could possibly have "undermined the confidence of the ryots;" it embraced a large variety of cases, for it was necessary to draw practical conclusions which, on so delicate and important a subject, single instances would not safely support; it gave those cases in detail, because the Government required suggestions of remedial measures which could only be deduced from the nature of the transactions by which, if at all, this "embarrassing" belief had been so long kept up.

1340.
1279.

All this, important everywhere, was peculiarly so at Baroda, where not only is the prince, like other Indian princes, subject to our general supremacy, but our authority mingles in some sort with his in the actual government of the country; for, through former events, most of his wealthy subjects hold our guarantee (bhandree) against his oppression; and this guarantee lets or drags us into many disputes with which elsewhere in India we should not interfere. Both he (or the party ruling in his name) and many of his subjects have therefore unusually strong inducements to try to influence the measures of our Government by whatever means; practised agents in bribery, too, have every reason for fomenting disputes which may keep their vocation active. Prince, ministers, and subjects, all have an interest in buying the aid of our officers, if they can, sometimes in opposition to each other's interests, and sometimes against those of our own Government.

Corrupt intrigues had accordingly originated here, which were still fresh in public recollection, and were far more flagrant in their character than any other which had of late attempted the integrity of the Western Government. The "Dackjee Dadajee" organization, for bribery on the largest scale, had been

exposed only seven years before the date of the Government circular, and the subsequent period had been filled up with events scarcely less damaging to the reputation of the Government, at least while unexplained, than they had been. Public attention was turned to this quarter; here this belief in the easiness of our virtue was known to have produced some of its worst effects.

The subject of investigation, as defined by the circular, was the *belief* in the corruptibility of Government, not the fact of Government having ever been, or the probability of its being, corrupted: and this was the true view of the matter; for, if the Government was *believed* by the people to be corruptible or corrupted, nearly the same harm was done, as to embarrassment and want of confidence, as if it had really been so.

We have then to place ourselves at the stand-point of the natives, and to inquire what were the facts which might foster a belief in the efficacy of "Khutput made in Bombay," so general and long sustained as to be "embarrassing" to the Government or its officers, and "destructive of the confidence of the cultivators." We may conclude such a belief not unreasonable if we find men known amongst their countrymen as inveterate corruptionists are long maintained in offices against the remonstrances and exposure of their immediate European superiors;—if we find such men succeeding for years together in their objects;—if we find that anything to be done in favour of known corruptionists, or in hindrance of proceedings against them, comes with promptness and decision from Government—while an adverse stroke, which must be struck, comes with hesitation and delay;—if we find that others possessed of surreptitious knowledge of the secret resolves of Government, boast of that knowledge, and use it to their own profit in advance of the official communications of the Government;—if at the inevitable end of a system of iniquity the parties guilty in an unusual degree meet on conviction with a punishment mitigated apparently for their especial cases;—if those who have long been in-

terested in these doings push the system further and at greater cost, and those who have observed it engage in it on their own account;—if, when a long-used machine of iniquity breaks down, another is constructed of still greater power;—and if, above all, while those universally known to have been the most active instigators and agents of corruption escape with impunity, sometimes perhaps ill disguised (as it appeared to the natives) by nominal punishment, those equally well known to have aided zealously and faithfully in combating the monstrous evil invariably suffered contumely, oppression, and ruin. If these things appear, surely the natives, at their point of view, *had* every reason to believe that "Khutput" actually did its work in Bombay, however incorruptible or even untempted the Government or its members might really have been.

The following condensed abstract of the cases detailed in the Parliamentary Papers relating to the dismissal of Colonel Outram from the office of Resident of Baroda should be read by the light of the foregoing remarks; and it must be noted that many of the documents of the Government, although in form and purpose the mere means of discussion or instruction within the circle of the Government itself and its officers, often really had the effect in many native quarters of the most public measures; for it was afterwards proved that the natives most implicated, long had faithful and very prompt intelligence of everything which passed in the highest and most private departments of the Government at Bombay.

1341. We go back to 1835, when Lieutenant-Colonel (then Captain) Outram assumed charge of the office of Political Agent of the Mahee Kanta, a semi-independent district of Guzerat, having its own chiefs. The office was subordinate to that of the Resident at Baroda, then held by Mr. Williams. It is necessary to employ a confidential "Native Agent" as the head of the Resident's establishment of clerks; and at that time Sarabhoy was so employed. This man belonged to a class called the Nagur, or Snake

Brahmins, noted even amongst their countrymen for unscrupulous avarice and subtle craft: he had placed many of his immediate personal connections in employment in the Resident's office, and others filled important Government situations in other parts of Guzerat. Moreover, he was closely leagued with the Bank of Hurree Bhugtee, which possessed immense wealth, which had the Gaekwar himself for one of its partners, and which was known by many to negotiate the bribes by which Sarabhoy and his associates profited. Unjust decisions, into which the British Government had been betrayed, had already established a general belief that this man and his connections had the secret but effectual favour of men high in office, when a case occurred to give weight and point to the conviction.

1342. The Thakore of Umleara died: he was a chieftain, subordinate indeed to us, but in a position not much unlike that of the Highland chiefs of 150 years ago, whilst still possessed of their ancient heritable jurisdictions. He left two widows, who disputed the succession, each for her son: one of these had been adopted according to the usage of India, and was the successor in the absence of real issue; the other, born seven months after the father's death, was entitled to the succession, if not spurious, in preference to the other. The decision of the Government was in favour of the former, on the ground that the child of the latter was not her own offspring, but was brought forward as hers in order to give herself the advantages of the mother of the chief during and after the child's minority. There seemed to the Government quite evidence enough to establish the spuriousness of the child. The country people, however, knowing more of the case, were of a different opinion.

A few months afterwards, the affair came under the official cognizance of Colonel Outram; and finding reason to believe that the Government was wrong and the country people right, he obtained leave to re-investigate the case. The Government reversed the decision, and

congratulated itself on having "escaped becoming
1342-3. instrumental in the commission of an act of great injustice."

But perjury and bribery came to light. Sarabhoy had been succeeded in his confidential and highly important office by his brother-in-law Brijlal; and it was found that Brijlal and Dowlutram, another *employé* of the Government, had received large bribes in the affair, and both of them were members of the confederacy which the people in Sarabhoy's time, just before, had believed to have the corrupt favour of men high in office. The perjured parties were

The THAKORE of GORASUR, a neighbouring chieftain, possessing power of magistracy from the British Government,

MOTEE GOVERDHUN, the Thakore of Gorasur's man of business,

JEEBAWA, a native British officer, entrusted with revenue management of a district,

ROOPRAM MEHTA and YOOLACHUND, men of business to the elder of the litigant widows,

And some others.

It was necessary to bring these parties, or some of them, to trial. The difficulty was to procure evidence in opposition to the interests and influence of the Nagurs, who were universally believed to have effectual secret influence at the seat of power, and whose vengeance
1343. was universally dreaded. The local British officers recommended measures calculated to overcome or diminish this difficulty; the Government *decided on steps exactly the reverse.* The local officers recommended delay until the decision of the Government on the case in which the parties had perjured themselves should have broken down to some extent their *prestige*, and disappointed the parties who had given the bribes; the Government, which at first consented to the postponement, *suddenly hurried on the trial, to the inevitable detriment of justice.* A certain locality was recommended for the trial, as tending to the procuring of a true result; *the Government fixed the trial at*

the head-quarters of the caste of the principal persons accused, thus placing them in the midst of relatives, caste-mates, and friends, many of them in office, and as deep in bribery as they. An inquiry, by officers who knew the country, the people, and the influences likely to operate for or against the truth, was recommended; *the Government subjected the case to an investigation which, while hampered with the forms of law, in which the accused were expert, had not the binding effect of a trial;* and that investigation was had before judicial authorities far from the scene of action.

Sarabhoy, really implicated, escaped conviction on this charge, having meanwhile quitted his situation;

1345-22. but he might have been convicted at the same time on another charge, had Government acted with even ordinary delay on a letter which had been some time before it. Brijlal escaped through efforts of the same kind made by the former perjurers, but

1344-17. was declared "not free from suspicion." Dowlutram was found guilty.

1344-18. A practice had long been established, of inserting in the Government Gazette a proclamation declaring a native servant proved guilty of corruption, incapable of serving the Government in any capacity again: and of this practice an instance had occurred but a few months before. The local British officers implored the Government thus to proclaim Dowlutram, on the ground that that step would tend to disabuse the natives as to the efficacy of Khutput at Bombay. *Government refused the measure, and contented itself with the mere private dismissal of Dowlutram from office.* The people remarked that this case, only the second in which the Government had indulged itself in such leniency, related to a caste-mate and confederate of Sarabhoy; and that the

1344. first, which had occurred not long before, referred to Chotum Lall, Sarabhoy's brother.

Brijlal escaped for a time through the new perjuries of the Thakore of Gorasur, Motee Goverdhun, Jeebawa, Juggabhoye, and the men of business of the elder

litigant widow. When the British Judge in Guzerat applied to his superiors in Bombay, for the depositions in Brijlal's investigation, in order to try the above-mentioned witnesses for perjury, Government replied that the proceedings were *not a trial but an* 1343-11. 1346-5. *inquiry*, and as the oath had therefore been 1343-12. administered without sufficient authority, the lying was not, in law, perjury. When it was proposed to reinvestigate the same charges, Government said it was *not an inquiry but a trial*, and so decided that the accused could not be tried again.

These matters occupied the time from the beginning of 1837 to the middle of 1838. Let us see what else transpired during the same time.

1352. Motee Lall Purshotum was the head native official employed by the British Government in the district of Rajpeepla. He had oppressed the people; but such is the terror, in India, of an offended man in power (still more under native Governments than under ours), that the country suffered in silence. Charges of corruption however were made against him in Nov. 1836, by Lieut. Ramsay, his British superior; Motee Purshotum offered to that gentleman 10,000 rupees to suppress his charges. Government ordered an investigation; but just as it was about to commence, a Government order so altered the administrative arrangements of that part of the country, that Lieut. Ramsay was displaced: being only remanded to his regiment, he applied for permission to stay to finish the investigation; he was refused, while another officer similarly situated in the district, removed by the same change, was permitted to remain for several months.

1353-8. On the subsequent investigation, Motee Purshotum was acquitted, and the Commissioner, who conducted it, exclaimed against the extraordinary perjury of those who had first accused him, 1354-10. and now contradicted themselves. Government congratulated itself that the character of so eminent a public servant had been so vindicated.

1355-12. A few months afterwards, however, events renewed the charge. It was then proved that the wronged parties and the witnesses, struck with consternation at the sudden and peremptory removal of Lieutenant Ramsay, so evidently to them the result of Khutput, denied the truth of all their former accusations, Motee Purshotum aiding the motives of some by refunding the sums he had extorted from them.

1356, &c. When however these facts began to come to light, and Motee's star appeared to wane, evidence enough was obtained to show what a scourge he had been. He was an accomplice of Brijlal, and was confined with him, pending trial, by Mr. Sutherland, then the newly-installed Political Commissioner. Government, however, desired these men to be suffered to reside at home only under a *surveillance*, which really could

1363-13. -16. do nothing to prevent their subornation of any perjury necessary for their further escape.

Dadoo Punt, a relative of Brijlal, was so clearly

1351-7. guilty of bribery that Mr. Malet, then Officiating Commissioner, confined him. Government censured Mr. Malet for "inadvertence" in so

1352-9. doing, and ordered him to be set at liberty. Mr. Malet had however a far heavier charge against him, that of falsifying recorded documents, and so continued to keep him in hold, notwithstanding the Government's order, until medical interference required his liberation. He had expected, through confining Dadoo Punt, to obtain evidence of the wide-spread cor-

1361-4. ruption known to exist. Government *quashed the conviction on the greater charge, because Brijlal, involved in it with him, was not present at the*

1352-11. *investigation*, and he escaped with simple unavoidable dismissal, for the smaller offence of bribery.

1351-8. In this case, and at this juncture in the inquiries into native official corruption, Government informed Mr. Malet that there was no law by which a Government servant receiving bribes at Baroda could be punished otherwise than by dismissal. The same offences, however, if committed in the revenue or judicial

departments, were well known to subject the delinquent to dismissal, proclamation of disgrace, and seven years' imprisonment. To what could the people of Baroda, daily witnesses of inveterate corruption, attribute this nice distinction between the services? Nor did Government bestir itself to remedy this defect in the law; for it was not until 1850, more than twelve years after this admission of the defect, that an Act was passed to meet the case, and then, we believe, not so much at the instance of the Government of Bombay, which was particularly under the imputation of corruptibility, as of that of the Supreme Government, which was comparatively free from it.

1350. Brijrai, (or Brijrye, or Vrijrye, all one name,) a British subject residing in the territories of the Gaekwar, was capable of throwing much light on the prevalent corruption, and especially on that of Brijlal, then under inquiry by Mr. Malet. This man was arrested, by the Gaekwar's authority, at the instance of Anundrao, brother of Dadoo Punt, and a relative of Brijlal, himself employed in the Commissioner's establishment. Mr. Malet wrote to the Gaekwar, asking how he came to imprison a British subject, and to refuse the ample bail tendered for him. The letter was kept back by Anundrao. For this offence Mr. Malet suspended that bold subordinate. Government *ordered his restoration to his post.* Brijrye remained in confinement three or four months. The

1350–2. Gaekwar refused him needful medical aid, and he died in prison.

1381–II. Venaik Moreshwar Furkey, called also Baba Furkey, or here simply Furkey, is a relative of the Hurry Punt Furkey, who often led the Mahratta armies. He went to Baroda in 1831, to prosecute claims of the family and of his own, on the Gaekwar and on the great bank of Hurree Bhugtee. The Gaekwar, whether at his own suggestion or that of his partners in the bank, drove him from the city of Baroda in 1836, and applied to the British authorities for his expulsion from the country altogether. His house was entered and searched, and it was intended to

seize his person. The British Representative protected him; and Baba Furkey aided most zealously and effectively in tracing the corruption then under investigation, at a time when no other native dare brave the vengeance of the swarming misdoers. Before many months had elapsed he was ordered by the British authorities, at the urgent instance of the Gaekwar, to leave the country, a measure, however, not entirely carried out. Some time afterwards he was appointed by our Government to succeed Motee Purshotum at Rajpeepla, who had at length been too clearly convicted to be retained any longer.

1383-13.

1383-11.

The period to which we have carried these cases is that of the second quarter of the year 1838. Let us review the results as they stood at that time.

SARABHOY had escaped investigation.

BRIJLAL, long favoured and powerful, had been declared "not free from suspicion;" but, while under other charges recently preferred, was placed, by the orders of Government, in the very position which most facilitated his corrupt arrangements for securing impunity.

DOWLUTRAM had been convicted of bribery, but had been sheltered from a disgraceful consequence of conviction which had followed in every like case but that of Sarabhoy's brother.

ANUNDRAO was again in office, restored to it, at the express command of the Government, after gross misconduct in favour of corruptionists, which resulted in the death of a British subject.

MOTEE PURSHOTUM, first favoured by the abrupt abstraction from the district of his British accuser, had indeed been at last suspended from office, but was not yet convicted, through inexplicable hesitation and tenderness on the part of Government.

DADOO PUNT, accused of bribery and falsification of documents, had been released by order of Government, and his conviction on the chief charge against him quashed on insufficient grounds.

The THAKORE of GORASUR, charged with perjury and conspiracy along with those who follow, was restored to his magistracy.

MOTEE GOVERDHUN was again the Thakore of Gorasur's man of business.

JEEBAWA was again entrusted with the revenue affairs of his former district, the highest office entrusted to a native, and he retains his post to this day.

JAGGABHOYE seems, in like manner, to have been remitted to his former employment.

And the two men of business of the elder litigant widow remained unharmed in their former occupation.

These were all notoriously guilty, and some of them were publicly convicted to every intent and purpose but that of legal form.

But BRIJRYE died in unmerited imprisonment, and Baba FURKEY long remained on bare sufferance, and at length could hardly remain at all, where he was courageously rendering the British Government essential service in opposition to the prevailing and deadly vice of its own servants.

By this time Mr. Sutherland had succeeded Mr. Williams as Political Commissioner for Guzerat, the title then borne by the Resident at Baroda. He complained that his native establishment was utterly untrustworthy and inefficient; at the head of that establishment was now the Anundrao, of whom we have just seen something—a relative of Brijlal, who, declared by Mr. Malet not long before unworthy of confidence, had been replaced in office by Government, and now was equally condemned by Mr. Sutherland; the other persons employed were notoriously under the influence of Brijlal himself, although he was then subjected to recent and heavy charges of bribery.

1348. In the midst of these transactions Colonel (then Captain) Outram had gone to Bombay, to confer personally with the members of Government on this most disgraceful and injurious state of things;

but although he returned with instructions to consult with the Commissioner on the subject, the whole proceeding must have seemed to the natives little better than a farce; for, it was while Colonel Outram was at Bombay, actually in consultation with the Government, that orders were sent by Government for the memorable reinstatement of Anundrao, in face of the strong representations of his official superior on the spot. Colonel Outram went to Bombay a second time, to state the extreme difficulty of effective investigation, from the Gaekwar, the Bankers, and the Nagurs, who were confederated against it, being so dreaded by all possible witnesses; and while he was there, Brijrye, the victim of Anundrao, died in the Gaekwar's prison.

1348–2.
1349–3.
1350–3.
1349–4.
1350–2.

So also Mr. Malet, while officiating as Commissioner previous to the arrival of Mr. Sutherland, was directed, in words, to institute "a rigid inquiry" into charges against Dadoo Punt; but when he thereupon confined that proved delinquent, a measure at once just towards the man himself, and prudent as promoting disclosures, he received, nearly as quickly as it could be returned from Bombay, a censure for "inadvertence" in having done so.

1352–9.
1351–8.

Looking from a native point of view at facts as they had occurred, or as they then stood, and taking into account local circumstances of unquestioned notoriety, it seems altogether impossible that a person at Baroda should come to any other conclusion than that the open boast of the corruptionists was substantially true, viz. that secret influence at the seat of Government was the real means of impunity to the evil-doers, and of disappointment, disgust, and in some cases ruin, to those who attempted to check them.

The complicated affairs next to be exhibited occupy a year from the second quarter of 1839; they relate

chiefly to some of the persons already introduced, and require reference to some facts belonging to the former period.

1370–5. The principal character here again is Brijlal. He had escaped full legal conviction on the former trial or inquiry, partly through defect of evidence occasioned by the Government itself. The banking firm of Hurree Bhugtee before mentioned, was known to be the principal agent in negotiating bribes with natives in British employment; of this Bechurbhoye was the head, Baba Nafra the deputed manager, and the Gaekwar himself a partner. Bankers had frequently been summoned to produce their books to British authorities as evidence, and Mr. Malet wished to exercise the right here, as one means both of discovering and of checking the delinquencies of which the effects were becoming every day more apparent. He cited, therefore, Bechurbhoye and Baba Nafra: they refused to produce their books without the Gaekwar's consent, which of course was refused. Their reluctance might have been overcome; for, strange as it may seem, this very firm held a British guarantee against ill-usage by their own prince and partner *, but they held it only during good behaviour, and they valued it as of great importance to them. To refuse to show their books for evidence in

1370–3. cases affecting the British Government itself was evidently a breach of any good behaviour which could entitle them to a continuance of the guarantee. Mr. Malet therefore proposed to offer the firm the alternative of relinquishing it or of showing

1371–8. their books: but this measure required the support of the Government, and that was refused. Meanwhile the bankers had dispatched agents

* These guarantees originated in the disturbed times, when we entered on the occupation of some parts of Guzerat; but although both the public events have long past, and the specific obligations have long been liquidated, in respect of which these

1370–3. engagements were originally entered into, the natives, who possess the guarantees, are extremely unwilling to relinquish them.

to Bombay express. The reasons of the refusal aggravated its effect. Two cases were alleged in which it had been decided that Government had no legal power to
1371-9. enforce the production of bankers' books as evidence. One occurred at a town several hundreds of miles distant, and far beyond the knowledge of
1372-11. the people of Baroda; the other was the case of Chotum Lall, the brother of Sarabhoy, in which the people of Guzerat saw the new doctrine applied for the first time, if, indeed, it were not devised for the occasion. The Government further said, that
1371-9. the circumstance of the party holding a British guarantee ought to make no difference unless the matter in question related to the affairs for which it was originally given. But all Baroda knew that those original affairs had long been settled, so that the guarantee had been continued for many years only as a general protection against the prince, held during good behaviour. To give this reason, therefore, seemed to them merely another way of saying that on no account should the bankers' books ever be required; and this impression was confirmed when the Govern-
1375-22. ment ordered their decision to be announced to the guild of bankers through its head. What could all this be held to mean, at Baroda, in 1843, a few years later, when in Bombay itself, under the shadow of British law, the Government seized bankers' books in the course of exactly similar investigations?

Just, therefore, as in the former period was established the principle that the corruption of British political servants, serving in native territories, although they were often charged with judicial and revenue duties, could only be punished by dismissal, while judicial and revenue servants, and even political servants in British territories, were liable to seven years' imprisonment, so we start in this period with the principle that the production of bankers' books, often the only means, and always the best, of proving corruption, cannot be enforced.

The prestige of Brijlal and his confederates had been

somewhat impaired by the vigorous efforts of the local British officers, although to appearance less supported than thwarted by the Government; and Brijlal himself, suspended from office, was under accusation when Mr.
1364-18. Sutherland, the new Commissioner, reported in April, 1838, a new and "clear case" of bribery against him, and gave the facts as much in detail as usual. Motee Purshotum also was implicated—he who had been so triumphantly acquitted of having extorted bribes in Rajpeepla, and had afterwards been
1364-19. convicted. Government, contrary to custom, called for *full* reports in both cases, a requisition which bore hard on Mr. Sutherland, whose establishment, diminished by suspensions under charges of corruption, and enfeebled by the universal taint, was declared by him utterly untrustworthy and in-
1365-24. efficient. He furnished the report, however, and within another month sent up three more charges against the same offender, Brijlal, all of which he considered fully proved; and he declared that, whether Government agreed with him or not, he could never trust the man again. Government refused to confirm the conviction in all the cases but one, and on that at length assented to Brijlal's guilt, and directed him to be dismissed.

We do not yet lose sight of Brijlal. In the case in which he was implicated along with Motee Purshotum,
1373-17. the facts were established chiefly by means of the books of a banker at Attersoomba, a town under the authority of the Gaekwar, seventy miles from Baroda. The banker, on citation, brought his books to the capital for examination. Detained there, however, on the business some months by the Gaekwar's obstructions to the inquiry, he not only suffered great inconvenience, but learned the new doctrine that a banker could not be compelled to produce his books. Now, the only charge then outstanding against Brijlal was that which had been proved by means of this man's books; the Government had set aside the rest. To get rid of this also would be to remove one principal obstacle to his

return to office. Accordingly some time after the return home of the Attersoomba banker, Brijlal petitioned Government, denying the authenticity of the books by means of which he had been convicted. Government directed the books to be sent to Surat (130 miles further from the banker's home than even Baroda), for a committee of merchants there to report on their authenticity. But, independently of any new notion of inviolability he might now reasonably entertain, this tradesman justly objected to the unreasonable expense and loss to which such a proceeding might subject him. He declined, therefore, to produce his books, and Government thereupon declined to confirm the conviction. Mr. Sutherland repeatedly and very strongly urged the Government to degrade "this great culprit" by proclamation. They denied that he had been proved a great culprit, and refused to proclaim him. The natives concluded that Government did not wish to convict him; for if they had, they would have directed the banker's books to be examined at the large commercial city of Ahmedabad, not twenty miles from the banker's home, instead of at Surat, 200 miles distant.

1368-34. 1374-20.

1367-32.

In the East, when a dreaded oppressor in office is once seen to be falling, the long pent-up discontent soon discloses itself in accumulated accusations. Charges accordingly continued to come in against Brijlal; but of these Mr. Sutherland would not notice any to the Government except one, a case in which Brijlal was necessarily included as involved in it with another person. He was clearly proved to have taken money along with Dadoo Punt, and Government were at last compelled to admit that he was not only guilty of bribery, but of the far heavier crime of falsifying recorded documents in his custody. But they still refused to proclaim him, and, like his relative and predecessor, Sarabhoy, he was suffered finally to retire on a fortune far greater than he could have realized by the honest fulfilment of his duty.

1369-37.

We left Motee Purshotum under accusation, in company with Brijlal. Mr. Sutherland had confined them to prevent their suborning witnesses. Government directed that officer to permit them to reside at home with only the *surveillance* of a common messenger; an arrangement which by no means prevented the access of their confederates. Finding, however, that Motee was preventing the arrival of witnesses against himself, Mr. Sutherland confined him again. Several offences were proved against him to the satisfaction of Mr. Sutherland, some of direct bribery, others of refunding the bribes he had formerly taken, as before noticed. Government, however, with several charges at once in its hands, took them by detail, found flaws in the evidence of each, and so got rid of them, while their accumulative effect would have been far more than requisite for rational conviction. Motee Purshotum thus escaped with simple dismissal, while Mr. Sutherland strongly urged Government to proclaim him; and twelve months afterwards, it is stated by the Advocate-General, he was engaged in one of the most celebrated modern intrigues of India, to be noticed hereafter—an attempt to bribe the Bombay Government wholesale;—selected for the service by the Durbar from his former striking success.

1355–12.
1356.
1357.
1358–25.
1360–33.

The Thakore of Gorasur, emboldened by impunity, perjured himself again in the Court of Colonel Outram, and grossly insulted that officer in the performance of his duty. Colonel Outram begged for some measure which, promptly taken, should uphold the dignity and authority of the Government. The Government, however, six months afterwards, merely directed the Thakore to be reprimanded at Baroda, 130 miles distant, and to be fined in an amount "consistent with his circumstances." A journey to receive the reprimand would easily be represented to his foresters and mountaineers as a visit of honour; and the fine could only be taken as a punishment in pre-

1346–7.
1347–10.

tence, for his circumstances had been officially reported by a British Judge to be so bad "as to be against his acting honestly in proceedings brought before him."

We need not pursue the course of the other persons already introduced into this statement further. Nothing is here omitted which would alter the appearance of the facts, or the estimate to be formed of their effect on the minds of the natives. Either impunity, or punishment very like impunity in popular estimation, was still the lot of the corruptionists; labour, vexation, and the miseries of distrust embittered the efforts of the local British officers, and few were the natives who ventured to expose the misdeeds of men whom fortune, or the secret favour of Government, seemed to them so evidently to prosper.

1375-2. Colonel Outram left Guzerat in October, 1838, to join the army which invaded Afghanistan; he went first to Bombay, where he laid his impressions and opinions on the subject fully before his

1376. superiors, and showed by actual instances what were the consequences of the steps the Government had taken. He returned to Guzerat as Resident at the court of the Gaekwar in May, 1847. In September, 1848, ill health compelled him to leave Baroda for a time, and he went to Egypt, where his life was said in India, at one time, to be despaired of. Captain French was "Acting Resident" in his absence. Early in 1850, however, he resumed charge of the Residency; and to the date of this resumption our next division extends.

We have said that Motee Purshotum was dismissed from his office in Rajpeepla, where (December, 1837)

1383-11. Baba Furkey was appointed by Mr. Malet to succeed him. Motee had learned enough to be convinced that bribery could be made gainful, while the principles of late established by the Government rendered detection far more difficult than ever. He found ere long new and congenial employment.

Baba Nafra, agent of Hurree Bhugtee's bank*, too, had profited by observation. Events soon encouraged him to speculate more largely than ever on the chances of escape which he saw so well exemplified in the case of his confederate Brijlal and their common friends.

The Gaekwar, a partner in the house in which Baba Nafra was manager, as well as the sovereign of the country, was under certain treaty engagements with the British Government for the maintenance, out of his revenues, of a body of cavalry called "the Guzerat Irregular Horse." The abolition of this engagement had long been an object with the then reigning prince, on whom, for misconduct, it had been originally imposed. Intrigues were therefore set on foot at Bombay at considerable cost, with a view to obtaining its abrogation through the corrupt favour of the several members of the Government. Motee Purshotum, whom the Gaekwar believed to be secretly in favour with members of the Government, was one of the principal agents in the business; he was sent to Bombay. Gopallrow Myral, the virtual minister of the Gaekwar, was the soul of it; Baba Nafra also was deeply concerned, and was afterwards interdicted the Residency for his share in it. The sums allotted by the bribers, to the different members and officers of Government,
1360–33. but never alleged to have been received by them, were as follows:—

	Rupees.
To Sir James Carnac . . .	1,000,000
„ Mr. Willoughby . . .	250,000
„ Mr. Reid	60,000
„ Shree Crustna	36,000
„ Dr. Brown and all the minor parties	110,000
	1,456,000

a total equivalent to 120,000*l.* sterling.

* This bank, one of the most celebrated and important in Western India, will come frequently under notice. It seems to have existed, at the date of these events, about 70 years; and it is

It is extremely difficult to imagine that parties who had been so long in communication with the Government of Bombay should have ventured on an attempt of this character, of which even the machinery must have been very costly, and the danger in case of repulse or detection great, if they had not believed, from what they had seen, that notwithstanding all the professions of the British Government, their object could really be effected by Khutput.

These intrigues, begun in 1840, were detected and frustrated in 1842. To Baba Nafra himself, two or three years later, a still higher chance presented itself. His master, Becher Samuldass, the head of the house
323-2. of Hurree Bhugtee, died in September, 1845, leaving two widows. Mahaluxmeebaee Settanee, the elder of these, had one child, a son, then three years old, of weakly constitution and apparently of somewhat feeble mind. Joitabaee Settanee, the younger widow, was *enceinte* at the time of her husband's death, and gave birth to a son in the following month of December. The child, whether genuine, as proved by evidence afterwards, or spurious, as Baba Nafra a year subsequently and then first alleged, was at least treated as the true posthumous child of the wealthy banker; it was named and soon after betrothed in the presence of the prince, and with all the ceremonies of the caste, observed in the costly manner befitting an affluent parentage. The unquestioning concurrence in these ceremonies of the relations of Becher Samuldass' other widow, the fortune of whose son was so seriously affected by the advent of this equal sharer, seems to testify still more strongly to the

referred to in Grant Duff's "History of the Mahrattas," iii. 215, as one of the two banks in Baroda which had gained great wealth by advances, made at exorbitant interest, to the Arabs and other mercenaries of the Gaekwar, paid as they were, like all other native soldiery, with miserable irregularity. At the beginning of the present century, and before the giving of our guarantees, this bank, often opposed to the other, divided with it great part of the powers of the State—such was the influence of both these banks with the Gaekwar and the mercenaries, whom they at once supplied and beggared.

absence of suspicion at any time near to the alleged birth of the child.

Baba Nafra was not only manager of the bank; he had himself become wealthy and influential; and it is moreover testified of him, by one who was not his enemy, that he was at the head of a party of bankers who despotically ruled the Gaekwar, his prince, and a partner in the bank he managed. This powerful servant soon assumed a degree of control to which he was not entitled, and seems, moreover, to have formed designs in which the other widow and her weakly child were not likely to stand much in his way, if only he could rid himself of Joitabaee and her son.

321–14. 350–84.

Accordingly, in February, 1847, when the younger widow's child was more than a year old, its parentage was brought into question* by a plot craftily contrived on the plan of suborning persons from a village in the interior to claim either the child, or else payment of the price for which it was alleged to be sold to pass for Joitabaee's own.

324–3. 500, &c.

Joitabaee, and her father, Bhanabee, were confined by Baba Nafra under guards of armed men, the former in a dark room, secured by iron bars; the mother, Larbaee, however escaped in the confusion occasioned by the seizure of her daughter and husband; she first resorted for justice to the Durbar (the open daily court of the prince), and failing there to gain even attention, she hid herself to avoid confinement, escaped after a time into the British territory, and went eventually to lay her daughter's case before the supreme authorities at Bombay. The son of Joitabaee, alleged to be spurious, was separated from her, and sent to a village under Baba Nafra's control, where he died in about two months.

772. 326–7. 507–9. 478–2. 511–13.

The false documents necessary to support this case on the part of Baba Nafra, and to sustain him in the position to which he aspired, were of course soon

* It is fair to add, in estimating the motives of the parties, that the question whether or not she had given birth to a son still living, made to Joitabaee all the difference between wealth and station on one supposition, and obscurity with diminished means on the other.

forthcoming. One of these was an unattested will of his master's, by which he himself was appointed sole manager of the bank, and trustee of the family interests, which, if not altogether forged, must have been obtained from the dying man while insensible, and in the absence of all other persons; another was a pretended confession of Joitabaee, dated while she was in actual durance, that she had never borne a child.

485, &c. 488–4. 581–35. 530–37. 722.

We have stated these facts, as many of them were currently spoken of at the time in Baroda, and as evidence subsequently established them to the conviction of judges not too easy to be satisfied of their truth. Baba Nafra, however, had much to say for himself at the time; for no man would commit himself to such an enterprise without something to say, at least to those who would willingly hear him.

These things happened in February and March, 1847. In the following May, Colonel Outram entered on the duties of the Residency of Baroda, and within the next two months the petitions of Joitabaee Settanee, and her mother Larbaee, to the Government of Bombay, stated the case, and were referred by Government to Colonel Outram for report *. The petition

* It is well worth noting, as illustrative of the practical defectiveness in working of our system in India, that on the 4th May, 1847, that is, within a few weeks of the chief events, a petition was presented to the Government in Bombay, which, as Lord Falkland said long after, "contained a very clear account of intrigues stated to have been put in motion by Baba Nafra to ruin his mistress;" but this petition was returned, as not being from a party directly interested. If, however, in the system of our government in India, there had been a public assembly of any kind, in which a person entitled to British protection could present a grievance, and have it openly discussed as a matter of right, it is clear that the knowledge of the case possessed at this early period by the author of that petition might have been made available for preventing all the miseries which followed. England has such a place in her Parliament. India under native Governments has it in the public daily Durbar of the prince, however that institution may be practically perverted and debased. Our Indian Governments, retaining still the forms of private commercial consultations, have no equivalent: neither now has France, nor has Russia.

403–54.

absence of suspicion at any time near to the alleged birth of the child.

Baba Nafra was not only manager of the bank; he had himself become wealthy and influential; and it is moreover testified of him, by one who was not his enemy, that he was at the head of a party of bankers who despotically ruled the Gaekwar, his prince, and a partner in the bank he managed. This powerful servant soon assumed a degree of control to which he was not entitled, and seems, moreover, to have formed designs in which the other widow and her weakly child were not likely to stand much in his way, if only he could rid himself of Joitabaee and her son.

321–14. 350–84.

Accordingly, in February, 1847, when the younger widow's child was more than a year old, its parentage was brought into question* by a plot craftily contrived on the plan of suborning persons from a village in the interior to claim either the child, or else payment of the price for which it was alleged to be sold to pass for Joitabaee's own.

324–3. 500, &c.

Joitabaee, and her father, Bhanabee, were confined by Baba Nafra under guards of armed men, the former in a dark room, secured by iron bars; the mother, Larbaee, however escaped in the confusion occasioned by the seizure of her daughter and husband; she first resorted for justice to the Durbar (the open daily court of the prince), and failing there to gain even attention, she hid herself to avoid confinement, escaped after a time into the British territory, and went eventually to lay her daughter's case before the supreme authorities at Bombay. The son of Joitabaee, alleged to be spurious, was separated from her, and sent to a village under Baba Nafra's control, where he died in about two months.

772. 326–7. 507–9. 478–2. 511–13.

The false documents necessary to support this case on the part of Baba Nafra, and to sustain him in the position to which he aspired, were of course soon

* It is fair to add, in estimating the motives of the parties, that the question whether or not she had given birth to a son still living, made to Joitabaee all the difference between wealth and station on one supposition, and obscurity with diminished means on the other.

forthcoming. One of these was an unattested will of his master's, by which he himself was appointed sole manager of the bank, and trustee of the family interests, which, if not altogether forged, must have been obtained from the dying man while insensible, and in the absence of all other persons; another was a pretended confession of Joitabaee, dated while she was in actual durance, that she had never borne a child.

485, &c. 488–4. 581–35. 530–37. 722.

We have stated these facts, as many of them were currently spoken of at the time in Baroda, and as evidence subsequently established them to the conviction of judges not too easy to be satisfied of their truth. Baba Nafra, however, had much to say for himself at the time; for no man would commit himself to such an enterprise without something to say, at least to those who would willingly hear him.

These things happened in February and March, 1847. In the following May, Colonel Outram entered on the duties of the Residency of Baroda, and within the next two months the petitions of Joitabaee Settanee, and her mother Larbaee, to the Government of Bombay, stated the case, and were referred by Government to Colonel Outram for report *. The petition

* It is well worth noting, as illustrative of the practical defectiveness in working of our system in India, that on the 4th May, 1847, that is, within a few weeks of the chief events, a petition was presented to the Government in Bombay, which, as Lord Falkland said long after, "contained a very clear account of intrigues stated to have been put in motion by Baba Nafra to ruin his mistress;" but this petition was returned, as not being from a party directly interested. If, however, in the system of our government in India, there had been a public assembly of any kind, in which a person entitled to British protection could present a grievance, and have it openly discussed as a matter of right, it is clear that the knowledge of the case possessed at this early period by the author of that petition might have been made available for preventing all the miseries which followed. England has such a place in her Parliament. India under native Governments has it in the public daily Durbar of the prince, however that institution may be practically perverted and debased. Our Indian Governments, retaining still the forms of private commercial consultations, have no equivalent: neither now has France, nor has Russia.

403–54.

of the mother bore every appearance of truth, and proposed measures which recommended themselves, by their equity and moderation, both for investigation and
326. for the management of the property meanwhile. It however expressed great fears that right would be prejudiced by the native establishment of the Residency, which was under the control of, and in confederacy with, Nursoo Punt, the Native Agent, Baba Nafra's confederate, of whom we shall have much to say hereafter.

These parties were all subjects of the Gaekwar. Their right to petition the Government rested on the guarantee before mentioned, which clearly included the widows with their sons, and was held, by usage, to extend also to Baba Nafra, as a servant of the guaranteed firm. But then the British authorities could only deal with the case on its coming before them on complaint of some decision had under the Gaekwar's
403-55. authority. The Government on two occasions, if no more, urged Colonel Outram to report on the case; but in the first instance that officer could do nothing more than urge the proceedings of the Gaekwar's Government, and wait the result. Meanwhile at least this was known,—that at various times, from 1837 onwards, Baba Nafra had been proved guilty of great crimes in matters of which the British Government had a right to judge; besides the like wrongs he had notoriously done beyond their official knowledge. Nothing was known against the widow whom he had imprisoned.
328-17. In November a native court * (Punchayet) was organized by the Gaekwar's Government for the trial of the case; but both Joitabaee and her

* It is difficult to convey by English terms a just idea of native Indian judicial institutions and procedure. Judges, secured in their independence by being made irremovable during good behaviour, are unknown in the native system. Disputes are investigated either by the officers appointed primarily for revenue purposes, or by a body formed extemporaneously, a kind of jury of arbitration, called "a Punchayet;" perhaps, indeed, at times by a Punchayet under presidency of a Government officer. The "court" referred to in the text is a "Punchayet" appointed for the occasion by the prince, and selected, in part at least, from the advisory and executive body

mother Larbaee at first refused to recognize it, on the ground of the glaring partiality of its constitution. Larbaee had taken refuge at Bombay, and she long refused to leave that place to attend its proceedings.

At length, however, after much shuffling on the part of the court, much reluctance from Larbaee, (from fear of foul play in the depositions and from the indignity of the mode in which it was proposed to examine her,) and no little persuasion from Colonel Outram, it was hoped that the evidence would be completed; ill health, however, drove Colonel Outram away before this was done. Joitabaee and her relatives felt they were left without a friend, while Baba Nafra, with the wealth of the bank at his disposal, with influence almost irresistible in the councils of the prince, and with his confederate and kinsman, Nursoo Punt, to poison the mind of the yet unknown future Resident, was seen to have all chances in his favour, while his unscrupulous and resolute character left no doubt he would avail himself to the utmost of them. Larbaee with sagacity and courage which do her infinite credit, and with reliance on British honour, which ought to engage our most earnest efforts to maintain its purity, looked forwards for eventual justice to the investigation at the Residency, which would take place on appeal from the decision of the native court; and, accordingly, she firmly resisted the cross-examinations by which it was intended to extract from her the names of the witnesses on whom she should then rest her daughter's case; for she well knew that in the interval between the trial before the Gaekwar's court and the hearing by the Resident, the wealth and power of Baba Nafra would be remorselessly employed to bribe and intimidate them all.

330.
331.

335.
637.
406.

The court appointed to try her case were baffled, and they found they could only serve their friend Baba

of officers called his "Durbar." This "Durbar" was much under the influence of Baba Nafra; and so must have been the court, or Punchayet, drawn from it, or, in the prince's name, selected by it.

Nafra by declaring that they could not close their proceedings, although the completion of the evidence as far as each of the parties interested chose to give that in its own favour, clearly called for their decision.

335–36. 406–73. Unhappily Captain French, the *pro tempore* successor of Colonel Outram, allowed himself to make a recommendation in twelve days after his arrival, (Nov. 15, 1847,) which seemed to prejudice the widow's cause more deeply than ever; it was, that as the case seemed interminably perplexed with evasions and contradictions, and as it required investigations of great difficulty, and some, indeed, of offensive indelicacy, the parties on both sides should be called on for bonds to submit without appeal to the decision of a court of arbitration, to be composed of two members to be chosen on each side, with a fifth agreed on by both as their head; and in this the Bombay Government concurred. But neither was the case so perplexed as Captain French had been told, (doubtless by Baba Nafra's firm but secret friend Nursoo Punt,) nor did the offensive imputations and investigations yet remain to be made. The decision of the Court before which the case was pending had indeed been delayed for several weeks, but only by the contrivance of Baba Nafra's friend, on the speculation that something might be made of Colonel Outram's yet unknown successor.

479–10. 337–39. 341–54.

340–49.

The object of the suggestion which Captain French was thus entrapped into making, may easily be explained. In this case, which was one of persons possessing the British guarantee, the decision of a court acting under the ordinary authority of the Gaekwar, would be subject to a review by British authorities; but that of a court to which the parties had previously bound themselves to submit, would be liable to no such disturbance; where Baba Nafra was all powerful, and Joitabaee was a distressed and imprisoned widow, there was little doubt on which side such a court would determine. Bribe-proof and fear-proof Judges are not plentiful at Baroda.

Joitabaee however submitted; only, she
341–57. 453–17. desired professional assistance, copies of the papers in the case, money from the bank in which she was part proprietor for her own support (since she was destitute) and for the customary expenses of entertaining the arbitrators, and information of the persons her adversary had selected as his members of the court. She appealed on these points to Captain French (Dec. 30, 1848), on the ground, (too truly alleged, as he knew,) that justice was not to be expected from the Gaekwar's Durbar or its
452-13. members; but this resort to the Resident seems to have failed her; and moreover it brought down on her a threat from the Acting Resident of the withdrawal of that very protection of which she had now more need than ever, and which was indeed her last hope.

344–63. True to its policy of deceit as directed by Baba Nafra, the Gaekwar's Durbar falsely represented Joitabaee as contumaciously and definitively refusing to agree to the proposed final arbitration. How far they may have speculated on the chance of Captain French being willing to let Nursoo Punt direct the pen held officially by himself, can only be conjectured; but
489, &c. it is certain that the letters were afterwards found to exist, by which the harassed widow had done her full part towards the proceedings, and which Captain French himself might have seen, had not his suspicions been too deeply lulled to permit him to seek them. The carelessness with which he misstated the case even contrary to the sense of letters
410. addressed by Joitabaee to himself, is severely censured in the final minute of Lord Falkland on this business.

346–72. Strangely enough, Captain French was led to believe that Baba Nafra was originally an accomplice in the fraud of importing a fictitious child, which he now charged on Joitabaee; a fraud by which the other son of his deceased master would have been deprived of half his fortune. Still more strangely,

while he must have believed either that on one supposition this man was then a great scoundrel in the first fraud on the widow, or that he was a scoundrel equally great in the present persecutions of the other, he removed the interdict to visiting the Residency which, by order of Government, had excluded Baba Nafra ever since the memorable intrigues of 1843, and which had moreover been enforced anew in May 1844, on the express ground of the connection of Nursoo with these parties, then recently discovered; and, although Capt. French might have been told, contrary to fact, that this formal exclusion had long been practically disregarded, the removal of it at such a juncture did not the less appear to the people of Baroda a favour gained by their notorious neighbour, through means they knew he was much accustomed to use. Nor when Captain French suffered this man to approach him as a welcome visitor, it is not wonderful that his own statements are marked by glaring misapprehensions of facts. Joitabaee is blamed by him for going to Bombay to complain, at the very time she was a close prisoner in Baroda, in a dark room; and her mother is equally blamed for the same cause, who fled in fact from violence justly apprehended. Nursoo Punt contributed his share of the misleading, under the disguise of enmity to Baba Nafra, his kinsman, and really his close ally. His false insinuation to the new-come Acting Resident, that Sir R. Arbuthnot, while holding the same office, had acted in certain ceremonial matters on the ground of the child's spuriousness, while it was really on the ground of propriety and usage, aided his purposes with Captain French, although contrariwise it had awoke at a previous period the earliest suspicions of Colonel Outram, and of an officer of the civil service, who was little prepared to believe anything evil of this old man.

347–75.

946–7.

347–76. 772. 446–1. 455–22.

347–77. 637–2.

349–83. 1055–15.

Nursoo's well-acted antagonism to Baba Nafra gave the best possible cover to another proposal, by which

the latter still hoped to get rid of the only cause of fear he had, viz. British revision of the native sentence. This device was to abrogate the guarantee of Hurree Bhugtee's firm. Captain French urged this measure, on the ground that the Court of Directors had often desired a riddance of these anomalous engagements; that the Gaekwar's Government, so far from being able to oppress Baba Nafra, or the bankers generally, was, in reality, despotically ruled by them; and that the uses of the guarantee, which could have at any time existed, were therefore obsolete, and the original obligations, for the sake of which it had been given, had long since been discharged. The proposed measure, justifiable and even advisable on general grounds and with proper precautions, was at the moment extremely unjust to the parties immediately affected. Had this manœuvre succeeded, Joitabaee would have been left entirely to the tender mercies of her spoiler, acting through the Gaekwar's Government. Joitabaee expected nothing less than her own death from the measure. How little she had to expect, even with the advantage of the guarantee, may be judged of from the fact, that the Acting Resident represented to her that the guards set over her were for her protection, at a time when she could not move from one corner of the house to another, without a messenger in charge, appointed by Baba Nafra, moving along with her; when she had neither clothes, jewels, nor money; and while hundreds of wealthy natives had no guards, either of their prince's or adversary's, about them. The heaviest censure of Lord Falkland fell in the end on Captain French's conduct in this part of the case. Joitabaee herself spoke of it with a sarcastic warmth no more than natural. Her petition to the Acting Resident was returned to her half read; but its justice seems to have been in some sense admitted, for the *surveillance* over her was relaxed. But still, when she

350–84.
460–8.
460–9.
455–22.
455–23.
458–27.
410–107.
458–28.
461–29.
465–30.
465–31.
469–34.

asked for copies of papers in her case, they
409-1. 363-129. were refused. When she wished to employ assistance for the management of her case, she was blamed for troubling Government with agents interested in fomenting quarrels. When she begged that her petitions might be read, her letters were returned again. She reiterated her request for equitable arrangements for the care of the property pending investigation; but no notice was taken of so reasonable a proposal. Baba Nafra had removed all the old servants of the banking-house, and replaced them by creatures of his own; he was also in favour at the Residency. The widow was in despair. Colonel Outram was expected soon to return from his sick-leave in Egypt; it therefore behoved Baba Nafra to
471-39. consummate his schemes quickly. Accordingly, through the Resident, and by the formality of a petition of the elder widow to the Gaek-
482-15. war's authorities, he tried to induce or force Joitabáee to return to the house of her late husband, which was under his own absolute control in
471-40. all its details. She refused, unless arrangements were made for obviating secret attempts on her life. She appealed to the Government of Bombay;
358-13. but her representations and documents were very imperfectly, if not carelessly, transmitted by the Acting Resident to that authority; and as she
361-123. declined to bind herself absolutely to the
362-129. adjudication of a tribunal she could not trust, under circumstances which, if left unremedied, left her no chance of justice, she was represented by Captain French as refusing a settlement by arbitration in any way, whereupon the Government of Bombay refused its
472-41. further interference. She repaired to Bombay, where her mother lay sick, whither the Gaekwar himself was about to proceed on a visit of state, accompanied by Captain French, and where Colonel Outram was expected daily to arrive from Egypt. We leave her there in February, 1850, until we resume her story.

The facts we have stated, as well as many more afterwards fully substantiated, must have been well known to the numerous persons involved in, or witnesses of, so desperate and extensive a plot. Moreover, the people of Baroda knew that Baba Nafra's general character was well understood by the British functionaries from former transactions. It was, therefore, impossible that the renewal of his admission to the Residency, and the general success of his schemes, as far as they appeared to depend on the favour or inaction of the British Government, should not be popularly attributed to the hidden influences he had been accustomed, as they believed, to employ. His mission of a confidential servant, Joteshwur Echaram, to Bombay in July, 1847,*
1415-74. 1226. 1232. that is, as soon as the affair put on an appearance of unexpected difficulty, must have strengthened their belief, and would have done more so had they known, what was afterwards proved, that that servant spent a large sum in attempts at bribery, of which no distinct account could ever be obtained. Nor could the contrasts afforded by nearly contemporaneous events escape them. Blameless to all appearance from the first in comparison with her antagonist, (and afterwards proved to have been really so,) the widow, without his means of buying favour, had her petitions returned half read, very soon after Baba Nafra had been officially restored by the Acting Resident to the privilege of resorting to the Residency, from which he had been expressly interdicted by Government in 1843, in consequence of his connection with the intrigues of that day. Still deeper must have been the
1412-63. impression when it was known that Baba Nafra despatched again to Bombay, in August

* Some of the papers state this journey to have taken place in 1847; others in 1848. The difference seems to arise from the native year of computation, which is of a different length from ours, dividing about the time of the journey. The date given in the text is probably the true one; but, if not, it is only necessary to add, that in July, 1848, Nafra had a reason of the same kind, almost equally cogent, for such a mission to Bombay.

1849, with a letter to Mr. Willoughby, the same person, Joteshwur Echaram, who had been employed in 1847 to endeavour to bribe Mr. Reid; and this at the very time that Captain French was urging the Government to refuse further interference, by means of representations which the Government themselves afterwards pronounced "unwarranted by the facts." The effect of the refusal could not but be to leave Joitabaee to the power of Nafra, exercised through the Durbar. The interference was refused.

409-101. 361-123. 358-115. 470-38.

We will now follow more particularly the course of another individual already mentioned, viz. Nursoo Punt. This talented officer, a native of Guzerat, had served the Government for 25 years as a Revenue officer in the Deccan; he was probably one of the most able native assistants in that department ever employed, and his merits had been substantially rewarded. Nor does it appear that any charge had been made against him in that part of the Presidency which was calculated to awake unfavourable anticipations of his future service. Whether this absence of blame arose from absence of fault, or from that dread of the enmity of men in power which stifles so many complaints in the East, it is now difficult to judge. If the former be the truth, then Nursoo, after a long life of creditable service elsewhere, fell under the stronger and fouler temptations of Baroda; if the latter, we need not a more vivid illustration of one of the great evils of Oriental rule, which it ought to be our earnest ambition to remedy.

963-8.

In July, 1843, on a vacancy in the highly confidential post of Native Agent of the Baroda Residency, there were two candidates—Baba Furkey, of whom we have seen something, and must see much more anon, and Nursoo Punt. The latter applied for the situation on the score of health, since, although the Deccan, where he was serving, was more salubrious, Baroda was in his native country. But the new situation was of smaller emolu-

1054-4.

ment than the old one by 100 rupees per mensem, or by at least one-fourth; and Nursoo, with whatever motive, asked to retain his old salary in the new situation, but without success. If health had really been his motive he would probably have preferred Ahmedabad, his native city, to which his transfer would have been at least equally easy.

944–4. 1055–8. Very soon after his appointment, Government were told that Nursoo had taken bribes at Baroda so long since as 1832, when there on occasion of the visit of Lord Clare; but, either through the length of the time elapsed, or unwillingness to entertain such a charge against an old servant, nothing was done in the matter. It seems, however, that he did not enter on his office without at least one transaction which was very questionable, as events afterwards showed.

Nothing, then, had appeared up to this time which would have materially diminished the confidence of Nursoo's employers in him if his own future course at Baroda had nearly answered to his reputation in the Deccan. More important, however, in their bearing on his reputation, as well probably as on his own moral strength and tendencies, were his family connections. He himself had married the aunt of Baba Nafra, his sister was married into the Baba's family, his niece married the Baba's son, his first cousin the Baba's brother: his own sister is married into the family of Dadoo Punt, who, we have seen, was expelled from office for corruption; one of his daughters is married to a son, and another to a nephew, of Venaik Punt, who had been dismissed from the service of the Gaekwar and confined for misconduct, but was released in 1833 through Nursoo's influence, and who, through the same influence, was not long since appointed to a confidential and lucrative office in the Gaekwar's service. Government learned the extent and closeness of his connections with corrupt parties at Baroda, only soon

945–6. 1055–12. 964–*. 946–7.

enough to regret that they had not been equally well informed before his appointment, which, however, his high character induced them not to cancel. They confined themselves to renewing the exclusion from the Residency of Baba Nafra and others, which had been imposed on them some time before.

1122-B. This all appeared on the surface. But, from a letter found some years afterwards, he appears to have confirmed or established a corrupt connection at Bombay, at the time he passed through that city in going from the Deccan to take up his appointment at Baroda; a connection with parties afterwards proved to have been the chief agents of corruption.

1055-13. 1403-20. Unapprised of this man's antecedents and connections, Colonel Outram found him in office, on his own assumption of the duties of the Baroda Residency in May, 1847. His skill, his methodical habits, his exact and extensive knowledge of the records of the office, together with his quiet and unobtrusive manners, gained the respect of the new Resident. Suspicion was excited only by events as they occurred.

The first of these events was the attempt, to which we have before adverted, to put a false construction on Sir R. Arbuthnot's conduct unfavourable to the genuineness of Joitabaee's child. Then came

1045-17. 963, &c. a case in which Baba Nafra endeavoured to substantiate a claim against a British ward* of three lacks of rupees by means of the substitution of one document for another. Nursoo knew of the fraudulent nature of the claim, and had official papers in his own care which clearly showed it; but never produced them until compelled to do so. Another case was not immediately connected, like the foregoing, with Baba Nafra, but was a repetition, by other parties, of a device of his to ruin the Gorajee Pol, which had been defeated

* The term "ward" is here used to denote a person possessing the guarantee of the British Government. In this case the "ward" was Govind Row Gaekwar, a relative of the reigning prince, living under British protection at Ahmedabad.

by Mr. Malet in 1837; and here again Nursoo, ever ready, methodical, and exact on all other subjects, failed to produce the information he possessed, which would have proved the case conclusively against the plotters.

Thus, before he was aware that Nursoo and Baba Nafra had close family ties, Colonel Outram became convinced of their collusion. Alarmed, it seems, at an unexpected strictness of supervision, and at Colonel Outram's vigorous measure of employing Baba Furkey to unravel the intrigues of Nafra in which he was himself involved, Nursoo applied in June to be removed to employment elsewhere.

1056–19. 962.

1404–*. Colonel Outram, not aware of this application, had reported unfavourably of his conduct in the cases above mentioned, and had shown that he must have been guilty either of corrupt collusion with Nafra, or of culpable neglect. He recommended, however, that Nursoo should be permitted to profit by any doubt the Government might entertain, by being allowed to retire on the pension due to his length of service, for which he had then applied. Colonel Outram had, however, charged Nursoo himself personally with his faults, who thereupon sent a petition by a private channel to Bombay without the knowledge of his superior, praying that he might not be condemned unheard; which petition was received by the Government, although presented in so irregular a manner.

1407-†. 958–20.

In this state of things ill health necessitated Colonel Outram's departure for Bombay (12th September, 1848), where he stayed six weeks, and where he repeatedly offered any personal explanation required by the reports above mentioned, which he had sent to the Government some weeks before. He had no opportunity, however, of discussing the reports, for they were always "in Mr. Reid's hands." Nursoo's irregular petition for a hearing was not breathed of to him then, and a copy of it, when its

1408–47.

existence had come to his knowledge long after, was refused him. Having apprized his acting successor, Captain French, of the state of things at Baroda, and in particular of the estimation he had been compelled to form of Nursoo Punt, Colonel Outram left Bombay for Egypt in November, 1848. He went away impressed with the belief that his unfaithful Native Agent would be permitted to retire on his pension, according to his own ostensible application, but really to return early in 1850 to a final struggle with him.

1062-36. 877-75. 759-3. 765-42. 1405-30.

The events of that interval now claim our attention, one topic, however, being first noticed. The fraud attempted on British subjects by the bank of Hurree Bhugtee through Baba Nafra, its manager, seemed to Colonel Outram amply sufficient, independent of its known complicity with corruptions of former dates, to justify the cancelling of the guarantee which in fact it held only during good behaviour. That measure, which in a more general form had been repeatedly pressed by the Court of Directors, he strongly urged on the Bombay Government, but without effect. Happily, in this case, the success of the Baroda corruptionists, if they really influenced the question, preserved the very authority which afterwards brought them to justice.

1405-33.

It will be remembered that at the period of Colonel Outram's departure from Baroda on sick leave, 12th September, 1848, the proceedings of the native court in the case of the widow Joitabaee awaited apparently only a formal conclusion, which seemed to be delayed merely for the chances which the coming change at the Residency might afford in Baba Nafra's favour. A period of about seven weeks elapsed before the new Acting Resident, Captain French, arrived. On an early day in this interval Nurspo surreptitiously obtained the signature of the First Assistant in Charge to a statement that the British Government

1409-‡. 1013-15.

would interfere no further in Joitabaee's affairs. To Baba Nafra the importance of such an intimation to the harrassed widow consisted in its being calculated to induce her to give up the contest in despair. But the Assistant had no authority to make such a declaration, nor would "he have dared" to commit himself to an act which transcended the powers even of the Resident, his superior, had he been present. His signature was obtained by fraud.

1409-‡. 1012-6. 1067-1. Little more than a fortnight after this achievement, a sum of 28,070 rupees seems to have been received by Nursoo from Baba Nafra, a part of a much larger sum agreed on between them, whether for Nursoo's own benefit, or under the pretence of bribes in higher quarters, seems uncertain. The curious discovery of this transaction three years afterwards, and the trial on which this was one of the charges, will be noticed hereafter. The facts just stated failed of legal proof, but were held by

1022-V. the Commissioner who tried the case to attach "great suspicion" to Nursoo, in which opinion the Government found itself obliged to concur.

765-42. Captain French arrived at Baroda on the 2nd of November, 1848, with but little disposition to suspect his Native Assistant. The warnings of Colonel Outram as to both Nursoo and Baba Nafra had small weight with him, and the records of the very recent cases in which Nursoo's conduct had lost him the confidence of one superior seemed to be fruitless even of caution to the other.

951-J. 1012-8. 1023-46. With incaution apparently induced by recent and evident success, Nursoo seems at this juncture to have boasted openly of the favour and support of Mr. Reid, to have expressed his contempt for the opposition of Colonel Outram, and is even said to have vaunted the sums he would spend in procuring the assistance of European gentlemen at Bombay. This conduct was denounced to Government at the time, 25th November, 1848; and if the pseudonymous authority on which the accusation

rested, was no better than such as in most instances in India first timorously brings oppression and abuses to light, it ought at least to have been held good enough to require instant and urgent inquiry. Any such inquiry was, however, omitted, if not stifled, for the time, and was effected at last without the good-will of the Government of Bombay.

950-B.

With such an adviser and informant as Nursoo at his elbow, Captain French found means to report on Joitabaee's case on the twelfth day after his arrival at the important and busy station of Baroda; and, as already stated, he was betrayed into recommending that the inquiry into it by the native Court, then far advanced towards a conclusion, should be re-opened in the form most of all favourable to the success of Nursoo's secret and most unscrupulous friend. No doubt, however, Captain French was persuaded that he could give the affair a different turn; an opinion in which his official superiors afterwards greatly disagreed with him.

335-36. 760.

761-17.

411-113.

Recollecting that our principal object is to estimate the effect of facts as they occurred on the public mind at Baroda, it is now important to note in detail the events of December, 1848, and the following month.

Government already knew Nursoo's intimate connection with Baba Nafra; Baba Nafra had himself long been well known to them as an inveterate corruptionist; Nursoo had just been denounced to them by Colonel Outram as untrustworthy, and as probably in deep actual collusion with Baba Nafra; and he had also been accused, in a petition then before them, of openly boasting, in Baroda, of his reliance on Mr. Reid, and of indicating, not obscurely, the means by which he could and would extend his influence at Bombay.

Under these circumstances, Government, while it confirmed the conclusion of Colonel Outram, that the firm of which Baba Nafra was manager had endeavoured to defraud Govind Row Gaekwar, a British

ward, of a very large sum, took no notice of
1406–37; 1408–note. the fraud, amounting to constructive forgery, by which it had been attempted, nor did they of two letters to Members of Council, intimating, in no ambiguous terms, that they would find their advantage in favouring the house of Hurree Bhugtee; they
962. 960–25. censured Colonel Outram, in his absence, for employing Baba Furkey in a case for which that native was especially fitted, when he could no longer trust Nursoo in it; they acquiesced in
361. 409–99. Captain French's proposal for a new inquiry into Joitabaee's case, which (although doubtless they did not then know it) would have deprived that lady of her best chance of justice; and they censured Colonel Outram's treatment of Nursoo, defend-
663, &c. 1406. ing that native official against the conclusions of the Colonel, on the strange ground, that since it was the Resident's duty to ask questions, it was no crime in this confidential agent to omit to state what he knew, however vitally it affected the case, if only he were not asked about it. Moreover, the Government virtually asked Nursoo to withdraw his application for pension and to remain at his post, on the ground that while Colonel Outram's charges against
979–39. 961. him "did not require explanation" from Nursoo "on any single point," Nursoo might have applied to retire, "from feeling it impossible to serve under Colonel Outram, after what he may consider the unjust treatment he has received at his hands,"—a difficulty then for the present removed by Colonel Outram's absence on sick-leave.

More strange still, however, were the following occurrences:—

1061–34. 1411–52. On the 3rd of January, 1849, some person in Bombay, never clearly identified, wrote to Nursoo the following letter:—

"The Honorable Mr. Reid desires me to inform you "that your petition, dated 18th September last, has "been received by Government, and, after carefully "reading it, and taking into consideration your services

"for thirty years, Mr. Reid wrote a minute, strongly "recommending your case to the merciful considera- "tion of Government. Accordingly, an order will be "issued in a few days to Captain French, desiring him "to tell you, that as Colonel Outram is gone from "Baroda, if you wish to continue as Native Agent, "Government will have no objection to your with- "drawing your application for pension. Captain French "will also be informed that Baba Furkey is not to be "allowed to have any thing to do with Government "business.

"Mr. Reid says when he goes out of council he will "recommend you to the protection of Mr. Wil- "loughby*, but that you should be very careful how "you conduct yourself: you must not on any account "allow your private feelings of enmity against Baba "Nafra to interfere with the business of the house of "Hurree Bhugtee at the Residency. That firm is an "old firm, and in consideration of the services which "that firm rendered in former years to the Gaekwar "Government, the Bombay Government treats them "with respect; and though Colonel Outram strongly "recommended that their bhandree (guarantee) should "be cancelled, still, by the favour of Mr. Reid and Mr. "Willoughby, this has not been done; therefore you "must not try from bad feelings to injure that firm.

"Yours, &c.

(Signed) "J. R. MAURRICE."

"P.S. Keep the contents of this letter secret, and "as soon as you read it write an answer to me, and "thank Mr. Reid for his kindness to you. Address me "by post, at Mr. Reid's house, Bombay." †

* Baba Nafra sent one of his known emissaries of corruption to Bombay with a letter for Mr. Willoughby in the following month of August. 1412–63.

† The reference to Nursoo's enmity to Hurree Bhugtee's firm, that is, to Baba Nafra, its manager, is only to be accounted for by remembering that, at this time, Nursoo kept up a feigned appearance of enmity to his real confederate Baba Nafra. If this letter were obtained from Bombay by some mere trick of Nursoo, and at his own dictation, in order to keep up his importance at Baroda at this

This letter, it was afterwards found, faithfully pre-informed Nursoo of the impending resolution of the Government in his favour in every particular. He received it on the 7th of January, and not long after showed it about, so far at least that a copy of it subsequently reached the Resident. Whoever the writer, it was written while Government had before it, as we have seen,

1412-56.

1. A petition of Nursoo, not yet disposed of by them.
2. A charge of Colonel Outram's of two attempted frauds on the part of Baba Nafra and others.
3. A charge of Colonel Outram's against Nursoo of collusion with Baba Nafra in those frauds.
4. An application of Nursoo's to be permitted to retire on a pension.

Government had also just before fallen into Captain French's views as to a new court in the Joitabaee case.

Now let us see what are the accompanying occurrences.

This letter reached Baroda on the 7th. Government dispatches, exactly corresponding in substance with its contents, arrived at the Residency on the 8th and 15th. On the 4th, Government, assuming that Nursoo had been induced to apply for his pension in consequence of Colonel Outram's treatment of him, told him, as we have before shown, that they had no objection to his withdrawing his application.

951-J.
1408-‡.
1014-24.
1046-3.

The pseudonymous petition presented to them on the 25th of November, accusing Nursoo of boasting of Khutput influence in Bombay, was only referred by Government to Baroda for inquiry on the *very same day*

particular juncture of Joitabaee's case, we may easily suppose him to have used this expression to aid him in keeping up the false appearance of disagreement. But this supposition that the letter might possibly be concocted by Nursoo himself, only lets in the harsher inference that he believed an imputation of corruptibility would be of little prejudice to himself at Bombay. If the letter were really written by some person in Bombay, deceived as Captain French at one time seems to have been as to the relations between Nursoo and Baba Nafra, that person could only be one who had long been in communication with both, and who wished to serve both his old friends, now apparently at variance

(January 4th) that they asked Nursoo to withdraw his application for retirement. The latter despatch arrived first at Baroda. The answer to the reference of the accusatory petition was sent, after a single day's inquiry at Baroda, a city of 80,000 inhabitants, and was to the effect that no such person as the ostensible petitioner could be found. On the 17th, that is, within ten days of the appearance of these documents at Baroda, Joitabaee, then in durance, was threatened that if she complained again of the probability of injustice at the hands of the Gaekwar's authorities her petitions would be returned unread, a threat soon afterwards carried into effect.

1410–*.

453–17.

461–29.

What possibility remained but that coincidences, preferences, anticipations, and information so extraordinary, should be universally attributed to Khutput?

The explanations afforded of these facts long afterwards are not of a nature to relieve very greatly the impression thus produced by them. They are, chiefly, that the petition against Nursoo, being in a native language, was long in the translator's office, and that Government never could find out who wrote the "Maurrice" letter. It is clear, however, from the Chief Secretary's statement, that the pseudonymous petition which charged Nursoo with openly boasting of the corrupt favour of Mr. Reid, was actually in circulation amongst the members of the Government at the time they wrote the letter inviting Nursoo to remain in the service.

1082.
1083.

Amongst the unaccountable facts of the subsequent part of Captain French's incumbency is the letter he wrote to Government on the 22nd of February, the month following the occurrences above mentioned. He said that Baba Nafra is one of a party of bankers who rule the Gaekwar and his court despotically. On the 28th of the same month he officially informed the Durbar that he had re-admitted Baba Nafra to the access to the Residency, which had been forbidden to him originally in 1843, and again in the following year. In April he returns a petition of

347–75.

Joitabaee's half read; and from the twelfth day after his arrival, through all the term occupied by these transactions, down to the following May, he urges the constitution of a new court of arbitration under the authority of the Gaekwar, ruled despotically as he had described him to be by Baba Nafra and his friends. These facts are here adverted to a second time only to show the connection with the Khutput proceedings in Bombay, in which they necessarily appeared to stand in the eyes of the people of Baroda.

1383–10. Let us now review the very different course of Baba Furkey. In December, 1837, Motee Purshotum was suspended from the office of head carkoon, of the Rajpeepla district, under the charges of extortion and bribery already stated. Baba Furkey, who had greatly assisted the inquiries into corrupt practices prosecuted by Mr. Malet and Colonel Outram, and had been much persecuted for that and other reasons by the then Gaekwar, was appointed to the situation by the first-named functionary. During the twenty months

1383–12. that he served in this office, under Mr. Malet himself, he earned a highly honourable testimonial, and he seems to have continued to afford such assistance in the exposure of corrupt intrigues as either the fears or the interests of almost every other native rendered it impossible to obtain from any other quarter. The Nagurs had been unearthed mainly by his digging, and if he had been vulnerable to their fangs he would not have been spared.

He appears to have fulfilled the duties of his office to the satisfaction of Mr. Malet's successor, when

1384–15. suddenly the appointment he had held for more than five years was, in March, 1843, broken up into four smaller ones; the displaced Baba, with or without his own concurrence, was left out of the new arrangements. Not a single fault was attributed to him; his six years of office did not afford his many enemies the means of advancing one single accusation, and surely, if there is one native of India deserving respectful consideration, it is a member of a noble

house, fulfilling with honourable fidelity the service he had sought in the subordinate ranks of the Government which had supplanted the power of his ancestral race. If there is one man in India to whom the heart of a British officer should warm, it must be to such a man, honestly and courageously fulfilling such a trust, when all was corruption, either in its temptations or its rage, around him. But, shame to say, it was afterwards avowed that the office filled by Baba Furkey was to be broken up for the mere purpose of getting rid of him. The reasons given were his great influence and his large expenditure. The first, an honest man in office is sure to have where honesty in office is rare; the second was proved to be entirely a misapprehension, in as far as it was not a misrepresentation. The Baba, too, was charged with having an independent bearing; a crime, surely, only in the eyes of those who look forward to the future of India as a perpetuity of degradation. But the officer who for such reasons at last effected his removal never reported his faults until the opportunity of action served the turn.

1384–18.

1387–33.

1385–22.

In the month of July following, the situation of Native Agent to the Baroda Residency became vacant by the dismissal of Hurreelal, who had been concerned in the Dackjee Dadajee intrigues. Baba Furkey, as we have seen, was one of the candidates for the situation, another being Nursoo Punt, who obtained it. The then officiating Political Commissioner, Mr. Remington, was required to report on his qualifications, and this chanced to be the very same officer who had successfully contrived a few months before to get the Baba dismissed from employment by the costly and circuitous device of re-constructing the official arrangements. The substance of his report we have already given, for it was on that occasion that he avowed the motives and purpose of his former proceedings. On the report of Mr. Remington, the Government resolved, 20th May, 1844, that Baba Furkey was "a very unfit person to be em-

1054–1.

1389–40.

ployed in any political capacity." That is to say, at the very time that Government had just learned that Nursoo, known to be most intimately connected with the men who at that time were excluded from the Residency for recent and scandalous corruption, obtained the vacant appointment, while the man who had served the Government so faithfully for nearly six years, that a fault was not to be found by means of which to get rid of him, was not only refused the post, but branded as unfit for employment. Moreover, this man, who, while as yet he was no servant of the Government, had aided it as no other native could or would aid it, in exposing and defeating corruption, had this stain affixed on him, promptly and certainly, without an opportunity of explanation or self-defence; but unfaithful officials had been discarded only after accumulated accusations and formal trials, and when apparently every device had failed to screen them. To what possible conclusion must these notorious facts have led the Prince and people of Baroda?

The Baba, however, residing yet at Baroda on account of the unsettled claims of his family on the Gaekwar, still sought to be reinstated, at least in eligibility for employment. His antagonists opposed to him a fictitious petition, which, on reference to Mr. Andrews, then Officiating Resident, was found to contain statements of which no proof could be discovered; and this was his position in May, 1847, when Colonel Outram entered on the duties of the Residency. He sought to see his old superior, now returned to fill the highest British official situation at Baroda; but he was repulsed by him as under an official stigma. He then petitioned the Government of Bombay for employment, and happily so far succeeded as to have leave, "on a vacancy occurring, to apply to the local authorities." The date of this permission is July 5, 1847, about six weeks after Colonel Outram assumed his office. It was during the next twelvemonths that the Resident, in investigating the affairs of the

1389–41.

156.

1390–*.

Gorajee Pol and of Govind Row Guicowar, found reason, as we have already said, to distrust the integrity of his native agent, Nursoo. Casting about for the means of effecting his investigations, which especially required the aid of native experience, he could think of nobody at once competent to such a task, and sufficiently independent of the corrupt or menacing influence of Baba Nafra and his associates, but his former able and courageous assistant, Baba Furkey. Turning, with more of regret than of hope, to the records of the office, he found not only that the ban was originally put on Furkey for most insufficient or fallacious reasons, but that even, such as it was, it had been rescinded by the permission to apply for employment subsequently given. This discovery, while it deepened his impression of the disingenuousness of Nursoo, who had misrepresented the case by his former trick of omission, left him free to seek the aid of Furkey.

1390–43. 1056–19.

By that aid these intricate cases were unravelled; the attempted frauds were made clear; and the complicity of Nursoo with those frauds was established by proofs which, three years later, procured his conviction on the most important charge, in which Nafra also was concerned, and subjected him to "animadversion" in respect of the other. The reports of Colonel Outram, founded on these proceedings, were duly forwarded to Bombay; he followed in search of health, and, before he proceeded to Egypt, offered every explanation both of the cases themselves and of the grounds of his opinion of Nursoo. No opportunity was given him. Yet, four months after his departure, Government sent a letter to Baroda, dated 12th January, 1849, to which we have already adverted, in which, while they confirmed his conclusions, they censured him for expressing suspicion (and it was no more) of Nursoo, and for employing Baba Furkey, by whose aid alone he could have established those conclusions; they justified the proceedings of Nursoo Punt, who, let alone, would have effectually falsified them;

962–A.

962, &c.

and they erroneously blamed the Resident for knowing the records of his office so little as to suppose Furkey was eligible for employment, while in reality they so far overlooked their own as to forget that the unmerited exclusion of him had been repealed.

978-35.

When Colonel Outram first applied to Baba Furkey to aid in these inquiries, that experienced native declined the employment, on the ground that any aid of his, if successful, would infallibly draw down on him the ruinous vengeance of powerful and unscrupulous persons whose frauds might be exposed. On the assurance of the Resident, however, that no harm would be permitted to reach him for faithful service to the British Government, he undertook the task: how well he fulfilled it we have seen; how he suffered for it we have yet to see.

1390-45.

It will be recollected that it was just at the date of Colonel Outram's departure, and of his Report of the cases in which Nursoo had misled, and Furkey had assisted him, that a crisis occurred in the far greater game of Joitabaee's child and property, which Baba Nafra was then playing. An inquiry was all but concluded, which would pass on appeal into the hands of the Resident. If either the impending decision could be prevented, or the new Resident be sufficiently biassed, the game might be won. But the most dangerous man to them, in the absence of Colonel Outram, was Furkey, known pre-eminently for his hostility to the party of corruptionists, and recently employed with searching effect against them. He had passed into the service of the Gaekwar, probably not without contrivance of his enemies, since he was thus, to a certain extent, stripped of his advantages as a British subject. The Gaekwar, a young and inexperienced prince, who had very recently succeeded his father, was ruled by Nafra and his confederates, as Captain French soon after testified. If the Gaekwar and the coming Resident could be made to distrust Furkey, the means of detection most likely to be used with effect against them would be set aside. A

321-14.

character attested by years of honourable service did not seem a formidable difficulty, when a feeble prince and an unsuspecting Resident were to be misled. The Government of Bombay were already sufficiently prejudiced against him; for at the very date of the "Maurrice" letter, and of the invitation to Nursoo to remain in the service, Government directed the Acting Resident not to allow the interference of this person (Furkey) "in any Government business whatever." The only danger was that of a revision by Colonel Outram on his expected return from his twelve months' leave in Egypt; the fear of which, however, was much diminished about the middle of the year, as we have already mentioned, by reports, but too well founded, of his increasing sickness.

1412–69.

Accordingly, about the end of May, 1849, not many weeks after Captain French had returned Joitabaee's petition half read, and had induced Government to adopt his resolution of interfering no further in her behalf, that officer found, or rather made, an opportunity of insinuating into the mind of the Gaekwar, the dislike of Furkey, which he himself had been misled to indulge. Captain French had failed to induce the Gaekwar to adopt one of his plans of improvement, very laudable in itself, that of general vaccination; and the ostensible objection, though probably not the real one, was that of expense; whereupon he said to the prince, that if he could not afford such improvements for such a reason, there was little wisdom in employing Baba Furkey at 200*l.* per annum, a man whom his father had expelled from the city. Here was in fact a suppression of an essential part of the matter, into which none had such an opportunity of leading the Acting Resident as Nursoo Punt: for while it was quite true that the Gaekwar's father had expelled Furkey from the city, it was equally so, and much more to the purpose of Captain French's guidance, that the Resident of that day had so judged of the case as to do his best to protect and befriend him,

461–29.
407–85.
407–79.

237–8.
1391–53.
291.

and that the animosity of the reigning Gaekwar of that day was in great part occasioned by Furkey's aid in exposing the intrigues for corrupting the servants of the British Government, in which that prince himself was deeply engaged.

The insinuation had, however, another sting. The blame of the opposition to his well-intentioned plans was laid by Captain French on the Killeedar, or treasurer, one of the Gaekwar's chief officers; and although the young prince was induced to take it on himself, the imputation (for it was meant to be such) was soon after made to take effect. At present, the only consequence was Furkey's loss of his appointment in the Gaekwar's service.

237-9.

In a native State there always exist schemes, more or less visionary or real, for displacing the reigning prince in favour of some other issue of the polygamitic connections of the previous ruler. Not long after the dismissal of Furkey, on the insinuation just mentioned, the Gaekwar became alarmed at a fancied or actual discovery of such a plot, in which he was made to suppose that his Killeedar and Baba Furkey were concerned. He resorted in trepidation to the Acting Resident, who thereupon referred to his former hint in the vaccination affair that the Killeedar and Furkey were in collusion, and he expressly told the prince, that as neither of them was a British subject the remedy lay in his own hand. Accordingly, a few days afterwards, the Baba's house was surrounded by fifty or sixty armed men, his papers were searched, some of importance to his old family claim on the Gaekwar's Government were abstracted, others tending to implicate him were introduced, his house was placed permanently under a guard of ten men, the ample securities he offered for his appearance were refused, and he himself was kept in close confinement two months and a half. Captain French says he in no way interfered, and doubtless he meant his conduct to be neutral; yet there are traces of at

237-10.

238-12. 292. 1392-54.

1394-63.

1396-71. 238.

292. 1393-58. least so much encouragement of his to the line of conduct of which this outrage was part, as to fairly account for the Baba afterwards attributing the outrage itself to his influence.

1392-61. Only two papers were found or placed in the Baba's house which could be made in any way to implicate him, and on those no steps were taken against him, whether from his peculiar handwriting having rendered a passable forgery too difficult, 1394-62. or from the papers themselves being insufficient to sustain a charge. Nor does it appear that any pains were taken to preserve the papers or copies of them, or to prevent substitution, afterwards 292. strongly suspected. Furkey petitioned the Bombay Government, 13th November, 1849, 1392-55. for protection and redress: his petition was six days afterwards referred to Captain French, who answered in three days more, that Baba Furkey was not then a British subject, although he might formerly have been so*. Government at once adopted this conclusion, on what was afterwards declared 33-8. by the Court of Directors to be "most insufficient grounds;" and they endeavoured to strengthen their case by alleging, that Furkey, having 1394-64. taken employment with the Gaekwar, must be held as liable, without their interference, to the usual incidents of such a service, and "His Lordship in Council did not deem it necessary to interfere to prevent injustice." But since it was admitted on all hands that Furkey had been at one time a British subject, and since, according to our maxims, he could not divest himself of the responsibilities of one, it ought to follow that he could not be deprived of his right of protection, except in matters relating to the

* This petition appears to have been written in English, and that may be said to account for its quick dispatch. But the natives could not fail to remark, that a petition against Nursoo lay two months or more before it was sent for reference, of which time nearly one month was consumed in the same official round of circulation that was accomplished in this case in six days.

foreign service, which, with its incidents, he had undertaken; and it nowhere appears that the charges against him were connected with that foreign service. Nor can we forbear to ask, how it happens that Britain, which so strongly, and almost alone in the world, maintains the doctrine of an indefeasible allegiance, should be able, in India, to shake off the converse responsibility of sovereignty, viz. protection, as in this and other cases, where the fulfilment of such converse obligations have chanced to be inconvenient.

1394-66. So little was the Baba in favour, that the English clerk in the Residency Office, the only available person, was afterwards fined a month's pay, and was sternly rebuked for writing a petition in

1395-68. English for him. Furkey, however, petitioned the British Government again on the 4th and 21st December for release under securities; and on the 10th of that month, his brother showed clearly that he was a British subject. Of these representations no further notice was taken than his release on bail, an advantage which he probably owed, in at least an equal degree, to the approach of Colonel Outram's return to Baroda, then beginning to be generally known.

1395-69. Baba Furkey wrote to Colonel Outram at
1395-68. Bombay; the letter was sent to Captain French for reply, but nothing was elicited. One of the conditions of his release was, that he should not leave Baroda for three months, the object of which was doubtless to prevent his presenting himself at Bombay to lay his case before Colonel Outram there, during the then impending visit of the Gaekwar to the Presidency under the guidance of Captain French. In the following spring, that of 1850, we find in Bombay most of the personages of our history, viz. the Gaekwar, Colonel Outram, just returned from Egypt, and about to resume his duties at Baroda, Captain French, Nursoo Punt, the lady Joitabaee, and her mother Larbaee. Thus is introduced the final section of our story, with its strange and complicated changes.

In the events just narrated, is it possible that the

people of Baroda should not have believed they saw the plain and certain effects of Khutput? The party known to be deeply active in its intrigues were in favour and power. The Gaekwar was known by the Resident to be ruled despotically by them; the Resident nevertheless rescinded the exclusion of their chief (Baba Nafra) from the Residency, and took exactly the measures most likely to promote their great object, the plunder of the Hurree Bhugtee bank; of the principal proprietesses of the bank, one was reduced to insignificance, the other was robbed, imprisoned, maligned, and deprived of her child; Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra swelled and basked in the plenitude and security of fortune; Baba Furkey, the old and staunch opponent of Khutput, was disgraced, imprisoned, and ruined, and the earnest avowal of the Gaekwar, two years later, of a full belief that he was innocent, and had been deeply wronged, was not yet available for either his justification or his comfort. To support this view in the eyes of the observing natives, it was by no means necessary to make out Furkey, or even Joitabaée, altogether blameless in every particular of their lives: it was enough that they were evidently wronged; that the wrong could not have been effected without the aid, active or passive, of the British authorities; that the wrong doers prospered; and that no motive comprehensible to the natives could be assigned for the strange and unvarying uniformity of these results, but the damning influence of Khutput.

492-2.

930-17.

934-1.

Appearances little indicated the storm about to rage amongst the persons assembled in April, 1850, at Bombay. Colonel Outram, ignorant of much that had passed at Baroda during his absence in Egypt, seems to have expressed to Nursoo, in Bombay, a willingness, since "Government considered him innocent, that bygones should be bygones," and a hope

764-32.

(by no means unreasonable, considering Nursoo's reputation with others) that he would give no further occasion for complaint. The Native Agent, however, seems, for whatever reason, to have thought it expedient to obtain his own removal to an equally important office at Ahmedabad his native city.

999–60.

Baba Furkey had written to his old superior in Egypt on the wrongs he had suffered; and Colonel Outram handed the letter to Government, when at Bombay. Captain French, when referred to, merely gave a general denial that Furkey had experienced any enmity from his native establishment; his letter, however, clearly showed that the Gaekwar habitually consulted him about this disliked native. Colonel Outram seems to have had his attention engaged to this case, as a principal subject of inquiry, very soon after his arrival at Baroda by a petition of Furkey's to the Government. He asked both Government and Captain French what share the latter had in the proceedings of the Gaekwar's Government against Furkey; but Government thought it inexpedient to re-open the question, and Captain French declined to answer, on the ground that he was responsible to Government alone. Within the first month of his renewed residence at Baroda, Colonel Outram defended the right of Furkey to the designation and privileges of a British subject to the subsequent satisfaction of the Court of Directors, and traced his sufferings to the vengeance of Nafra and Nursoo, operating through the unsuspecting agency of the late Acting Resident. The Bombay Government gave Colonel Outram "a virtual rebuke for bringing forward the subject;" for which, and for omitting to call on Captain French for explanations, they were themselves rebuked by the Court of Directors.

1396–71.

1397.

235–4.
1397–76.
8–4.

235–4.

Joitabaee, then also in Bombay, addressed to the Government a petition which may be referred to as a clear and truthful statement of facts as they were afterwards established by

771.

evidence, as a remarkable picture of the grievous defects of Oriental government, and a striking instance of the solicitude with which the principles of English justice are invoked even by those who have but little conventional right to their protection. Government, however, guided by Captain French's representations, still believed her only a defeated impostor, and again refused to interfere in her behalf. Colonel Outram himself, although he had a somewhat different opinion of her case, was, as yet, labouring under a belief, from the Acting Resident's representations, of Joitabaee's contumacy, and could see at this time no means left of settling a dispute which wore so strange and complicated an appearance, but such an arbitration as Captain French had already proposed.

406. 409. 397. 774–5. 774–7.

The causes of a change were, however, already in operation. During the first month of his renewed incumbency, Colonel Outram received, through the Government of Bombay, the remarks of the Court of Directors on two important cases. The first was that of Joitabaee, then almost closed, in the estimation of the Home Authorities, by Captain French's confident assertions of the spuriousness of the child; the other that of the fraud attempted by the Hurree Bhugtee Bank, that is, by Baba Nafra, on Govind Row Gaekwar, by the substitution of a false bond.

770.

1406-†.

Induced, and indeed required, by the opinions expressed by the Court, to re-investigate these matters, Colonel Outram was no doubt further stimulated by finding in the office at Baroda, on his return, the letter of 12th January, 1849, which the Government had addressed to the Acting Resident in his absence, in which, while the conclusions he had arrived at by the aid of Furkey were adopted, the dishonesty of Nafra (necessarily admitted in fact) was passed over in silence, the conduct of Nursoo was zealously excused, and his own proceedings subjected to a very strong implied censure.

962.

Thus forced to resume his old investigations, other occurrences afforded unexpected facilities to his efforts, and gave them the vigour which arises from the distinctness of immediate purpose.

The dreaded influence of Nafra was indeed active and intense, but it was only of that unsubstantial kind which is acquired by mere audacity of resolve, associated with cleverness of device. Like all other men who succeed by means of such qualities, Nafra lacked the wider and safer views, and the just principles of management, which lead, if anything can, to permanent success. Accordingly the affairs of the bank began to show symptoms of disorder and decline, which were attributed to his reckless unskilfulness, even before men dared to speak openly of the sums he lavished on bribes in all directions, and of his embezzlements for his own direct profit.

As, however, vast wealth still remained, Nafra and the bank might have held together some time longer, but that he ventured, in the security of success, on extreme ill-usage of some dependents who had been his accomplices (from fear, they said) in his oppression of Joitabaee and his abduction of her son. These men, whether from present suffering (for they were imprisoned by him, and had been for four months), or from revenge, or from remorse on seeing their late master's family ruined, made such statements to Colonel Outram, 3rd July, 1850, as to require the arrest of Nafra by the Gaekwar's Government at the Resident's instance, on a charge of abduction of the child, and suspicion of having compassed the murder of it. Mahaluxmee, who had been intimidated into silence from the first by Nafra's treatment of her fellow-widow, Joitabaee, was released at the same time from the thraldom in which that usurping steward had lately held her.

499. 779. 370. 520. 371-15.

Nafra seems to have betaken himself at once to measures of defence. The day after his arrest he pro-

777. 820. cured by misrepresentation Mahaluxmee's signature to a petition containing false allegations, which he despatched to the Government of Bombay, who sent it to Colonel Outram "for his immediate attention." Joitabaee, let it be remarked, against whom no single wrong act had been established, was then living friendless and repulsed in Bombay, while they bestowed this speedy care on a man proved years before, as they *knew*, to have been steeped in corruption (for their predecessors had excluded him from the Residency for it), in which corruption native public opinion associated themselves with him.

787. The stricken delinquent next pursued with vigour his attempt to bribe Nursoo's successor, Soorujram, which he had commenced on that native officer's appointment, a few weeks before. Nor was he too soon; for Colonel Outram had already caused the books of Hurree Bhugtee's firm to be seized and brought to the Residency, when Nafra sent 20,000 rupees to Soorujram, who had been instructed by his superior to entertain the offer, in order to the more effectual defeat of the present and discouragement of future attempts. The money was seized, under the information of Soorujram, while actually on its way to him, and indubitable evidence of its sender, progress, and destination was secured*.

787. It was not until things had reached this pass, and much confirmatory evidence had

791. 1437. * Colonel Outram urged that the decision of Government in this case should be given at once, in order that the difficulty in procuring evidence might be diminished, which arose from the long-standing and general belief in Baroda that Government really at heart favoured the makers of Khutput. Since the Governor and Mr. Willoughby thought the case "very clear," and, singularly enough, proposed to expend the impounded money on a bridge, to be called Baba Nafra's (!) Bridge, it would seem that there could not have been much difficulty in an immediate decision. Mr. Blane, who did not deny the bribery, proposed, however, to postpone the matter until after Nafra's trial on the heavier charges; the Government agreed, and thus left the difficulties of the

779. been obtained, that, on July 11th, Colonel Outram reported to the Government of Bombay, the arrest of Nafra, eight days before; for, after his experience, he seems to have feared, that until this damning case was put beyond the possibility of retraction or spoiling, some unexpected or unaccountable turn at Bombay might take all vigour out of his proceedings.

Another inquiry, however, now forced itself on his attention. On examination of the books of Hurree Bhugtee's house which had been seized, it was found that as many erasures and alterations had been made as the time permitted; this time was afforded by the collusive delays of the Gaekwar's officials, and the treacherous warnings conveyed to Baba Nafra from the Resident's own office. Yet from the books, however falsified, it still was left to appear, that from 30 to 40,000*l.* sterling had been disbursed at different times for Khutput in Joitabaee's affair; and amongst the items was one of 8000*l.* which had been placed at the disposal of Joteshwur Echaram, who had been dispatched from Baroda to Bombay in July 1847 or 48, as has been stated before, to see to its application. On the first examination of this man, it appeared that more exact information might be obtained from the books of Bulwuntrow, his brother-in-law, residing at Bombay. But Colonel Outram's suggestion to the Government to that effect was met with the objection, that in the town of Bombay, under modified English law, such a seizure would be illegal; and while explanations passed, that an information on oath (which could have easily been supplied) would have justified the step in law, the opportunity of securing the books previous to falsification was lost.

1216.

1218.

It was learned at the time, however, as it was after-

trial undiminished.* This is one of the cases in which the ultimate resolution of the Government was never made known to Colonel Outram, and which were not reported to the Home Authorities until the period for any use in reporting was long past.

wards more fully established, that Joteshwur had been sent to Bombay, at the suggestion, it was affirmed, of Nursoo, to bribe Mr. Reid; that he had given two sums of 2000 and 10,000 rupees for that purpose to Craig, an Assistant of some standing in the Secretariate; and as Craig soon after left Bombay for Calcutta, in disgrace on other accounts, it was supposed he had kept the money himself. Other persons were also concerned in the affair, but in an inferior way. The subsequent proceedings in this case, to which we shall again have occasion to refer, ran on contemporaneously with those which more directly related to Nafra himself, to which we now return.

1219. 1231. 1232. 1227. 1273.

Fairly in the toils, Nafra bestirred himself, according to his wont. He endeavoured to turn the main odium of the recent attempt at bribery on Soorujram, by getting Motee Heerachund, the go-between, to assert that the proposal came from the native official. He tried to discredit Furkey, whom, no doubt, he believed to be in the midst of so much activity directed against himself, but with whom, in fact, the Resident had had no personal communication since his return. He continued to use the name of his mistress Mahaluxmee, in petitions of which that lady had no sufficient knowledge if she had any at all; and, although fallen, he still contrived that his judges should be chosen from amongst his confederates and friends.

781. 785. 493-176. 784. 794. 496.

On the ground that the house of Hurree Bhugtee possessed the British guarantee, the Resident held a separate inquiry into the charges against Nafra; and, notwithstanding treachery in his own native establishment, and want of good faith in the Gaekwar's officers, it is to this measure that the eventual success of the investigation is entirely due. Shame, however, as it is to say it, while witnesses, the Gaekwar's subjects, were readily and

371-15. 375-29.

372-17. speedily produced to the Resident, those who were British subjects were only forthcoming after much prejudicial delay, and the most important of them was never produced at all. The evasion seems
372-18. to have been favoured, if not effected, by the native subordinates in the British districts, some of whom were connected with Nursoo and through him with the chief delinquent.

The preliminary inquiry at the Residency com-
372-19. 377-list. menced about the 5th of July, and ended on the 15th August. Immediately on its close, the proceedings of the native court began,
553-list. which continued till the 2nd of October, on the 22nd of which month the award was
536. 550. given, and sentence pronounced, subject to the confirmation of both the Governments.

In dealing with the case, the native court
383-12. took both the depositions in the unfinished proceedings of 1847-8, and those just made before the Resident. Most of the former, it will be remembered, were given before the native authorities,
384-14. 553. and while Nafra was in the height of his power; some of them even were taken by Nafra himself; Nursoo, too, was yet Native Agent to the Resident. The latter were made before the Resident and after the arrest of Nafra. The discrepancies between the two sets of depositions are enormous; the witnesses accounted for them
518, &c. by reference to the means of intimidation
686, &c. unsparingly employed by Nafra in the days of his power. Moreover, the former depo-
384, &c. sitions were afterwards clearly shown to have been vitiated by the substitution in many parts of fresh sheets; and there is much reason to conclude they were falsely recorded in the first
532. instance.

The story eventually established is this: Nafra, either grasping at greater power, or feeling the pressure on
459. the bank occasioned by his reckless management, wished to open the great treasury of

772. 678. 608. 610. the bank, which was kept locked and under guard of armed men, was never opened but on special occasions, and had not been opened since the death of the husband of the two widows. Joitabaee refused her consent, and, moreover, resisted and resented the undue assumption of authority which Nafra had carried to a most offensive pitch. She was in his way; to remove her child was to get rid of her power. An emissary of his, one of the three men who afterwards revealed the facts, found in Meetapore, persons—British subjects—who were willing, on terms, to pass for the parents of the child. The persons thus obtained were brought to Baroda, and lodged in Nafra's garden under Arab guards.

500. 555–3. 508. Nafra got a false deed prepared, which purported that Joitabaee's father had bought the child of these people for 200 rupees per annum during their lives. This deed he brought to these people in his own garden; and, with some chaffering, bargained with them to go through with the personation for 1700 rupees, a sum which, with the secret in their possession, they took care afterwards considerably to augment. Under his instructions they first went to the house of Joitabaee's father, and claimed payment according to the deed, or the return of the child; and being repulsed, as they expected, they noised the matter as much as they could, both in the city and at the bank. Nafra took down their depositions with all due form and gravity, gave them 100 rupees, which they asserted to be due to them, took from them the alleged deed of Joitabaee's father, and sent them away. He then confined Joitabaee, and took her child away from her father's house, breaking locks for the latter purpose; a degree of violence, on private authority, beyond even that permitted by the loose and inefficient law of the Gaekwar's Government.

500–3. 520–25. 521–26. 522–27. 523–28. 515–19. 516–20.

The plot was afterwards doubled. A dependent was required to join with certain persons brought from

Amleeara, another village, in asserting that the child was theirs; and, on his refusal, he was put in irons until he consented. Amleeara was chosen because the place and its inhabitants were entirely under Nafra's control; he could command the testimony of its people, and he could there dispose of the child or the child's life at his pleasure, which he could not do with equal safety at Meetapoor, a place under British authority. To meet the change of plan, the story was concocted that the child procured from Meetapoor had died, and had been replaced by Joitabaee's father with one from Amleeara. The wretched villagers of the latter place, who in fact held their possessions and lives at Nafra's mercy, and seem to have been amongst the poorest of their class, were brought to Baroda to claim the child. Nafra forged a document in which Joitabaee is made to confess that she never had a child, and to beg that that which passed as hers might be given up to the Amleeara people, from whom she understood her father had obtained it. The infant was then despoiled of its ornaments, and delivered the same night to the Amleeara villagers, in Nafra's garden; not without some repugnance on their part, they took it home, under escort of Nafra's Arab mercenaries. Two days after their arrival, the child and its spurious mother were lodged in a separate and secluded house under a strict guard of Arabs who prevented access to them; and here, in three months, the child died, as alleged, of cholera. Joitabaee was imprisoned in a dark room secured with iron bars, until she was released at the demand of Col. Outram, after whose departure for Egypt she was again imprisoned by Nafra, her actual confinement within walls being perhaps at times changed for a rigorous guard in the house, until her repeated and indignant remonstrances to Captain French

518.
384–14.
376–32.
506, &c.
571.
515.
530.
581.
517.
506–8.
513–15.
514–17.
510–12.
771.
453.
458.

extorted first relaxation, and then release, after two years' incarceration.

For this account of the matter the evidence on almost every point was direct, probable, and complete. The only defects, and these were amply supplied, were those occasioned by the death of the midwife, by the absence of the man, (a British subject,) who had personated the child's father in the first instance, and by the abstraction of those particular books of the bank in which the payments on this account were entered, and which were taken away by Nafra in the night previous to his arrest, in consequence of a warning treacherously given him from the Resident's office.

375-30.

Of course Nafra had a story to account for facts which could not be denied. But, of the witnesses who in 1847-8 had sworn falsely in his favour, for very dread of him, very few, now that the spell of his power was, for a time, broken, failed to withstand the threats and cajolery of Nafra and of his friends in the Gaekwar's service, by which it was sought to make them retract the evidently truthful statements they had made before the Resident. These few consisted of a pensioner of Nafra's, and of the miserable villagers of Amleeara; the latter dreading his vengeance, however distant the period at which he might resume his power, said and unsaid at the Residency and the Gaekwar's court, just as their fears at the moment dictated. Their true tale, however, was easily recognized by the consistency and corroborations which the other lacked. The Gaekwar's minister and Nafra's other judges, associates though some of them had been in many of his misdoings, and disposed to screen him, as they had all unsparingly showed themselves, could not resist the evidence against him: yet even in convicting and punishing they continued to favour him.

536.
618.
629.
634.

379-55, &c.

379, 52.
506-8.

378-43, &c.

The charges were framed by the Gaekwar's court into these three specific questions:—

537.

1. Had Joitabaee borne a child?

2. Was a strange child of an inferior caste procured, and passed off for a genuine son of Joitabaee, and a false deed produced by Nafra, in testimony of the substitution?

3. Was the child which Nafra delivered to the Amleeara people their own?

On the first of these points the court professed to doubt; but they fined Nafra 500 rupees for negligence, as the confidential manager of the house, in not ascertaining the fact at the time.

On the second, they say that Joitabaee did not pro-
543. cure a child, but that Nafra did; and that he
548. forged a deed by which it was alleged to be
550. purchased. For this, as Nafra was a Brahmin, and therefore could not be put to death, and as banishment would be inappropriate, they sentenced the criminal to a fine of 10,000 rupees, and imprisonment, in irons, for seven years.

On the third question they concluded that Nafra had given the child to the Amleeara people, without ascertaining whether it was really their own; and for this they fined him 5,000 rupees.

The whole punishment amounted to a fine of 15,500 rupees (about 1300*l.*) and seven years' imprisonment in
550. irons. The date of the sentence is 22nd October, 1850.

It will be observed, that this verdict leaves one main question unsettled, viz. whether Joitabaee had ever borne a child. The court professed to doubt whether there was disinterested evidence enough to establish the fact, although there was as much as is usual in such cases; and yet they not only convicted Nafra on the other points in terms which cannot be sustained on any other supposition, but they passed sen-
551. tences on the other parties concerned, for
552. offences which equally required the genuineness of Joitabaee's child to justify the expressions by which they are described. This formal defect
320-9. in the verdict was evidently designed to permit

Nafra to escape the heavier punishment of imprisonment for life, for abstraction of a high-caste child. Since, too, the verdict entirely avoided the real character of the child given to the Amleeara people, it avoided also the necessity for inquiring into the facts of the child's death, which must otherwise have come under review, and might have resulted in a still more penal sentence. But it had also another effect, which seemed to Colonel Outram too serious to be neglected, considering the position at that time of the general question of Khutput; the doubt left a chance of the mitigation of the sentence, and that mitigation might come, as so many had unaccountably come, from Bombay; for the final confirmation of the sentence rested, through the guarantee, with the British Government. Discoveries arising from the examination of the books of the Hurree Bhugtee Bank, showed that heavy work was yet to be undertaken, and any apparent favour to Nafra, at Bombay, would have weakened the Resident's hands for the task. At once, therefore, to establish the fair fame of Joitabaee, whom he believed to be deeply wronged, and to prevent the possible errors of his own superiors, he pursued the investigation still further, and by means of a Committee of British medical officers, which sat in January, February, and March following, he obtained a conclusive professional opinion that Joitabaee had at some time given birth to a child, after the usual period of gestation, and an expression, by the same committee, of a strong conviction, founded on consistent and varied circumstantial evidence, that that child was born at the time she had herself alleged.

690, &c.

821.

692-1.

654-30.

Here we leave the case for the present, with Nafra in prison and Joitabaee restored to her caste, to the public favour of the prince, and to a portion of the comforts she had a right to expect as one of the proprietresses of a long-established bank, reputed to be of enormous wealth. She was, however, still left bur-

379-80.

798.

862-H. dened with debts, incurred in the penniless state in which she had been compelled to bear her persecutions and withstand her spoilers.

Several matters, which at any other time would have seemed of more than ordinary importance, were on foot during the three or four months which Nafra's trial occupied. The discovery of Joteshwar's 1216. mission to Bombay for purposes of bribery, and the check which the consequent investigation met with in the legal difficulty of seizing Bulwuntrow's books in Bombay, have already been adverted 1218. to. Without waiting for this obstruction and answer from the Government, Colonel Outram had already obtained further confessions from 1221. Joteshwar, when anonymous communications 1222. were received, both in Bombay and Baroda, pointing out more distinctly than Joteshwar had done, the persons implicated in his proceedings. The Gaekwar's Government seized his papers at Colonel Outram's request; on which he became much agitated, 1226. and declared that they contained nothing relating to the present matters, but only documents connected with the former servants of the Residency, Sarabhoy and Brijlal, to whom he had been Gooroo, or spiritual adviser; whereupon they were sealed up, and he was promised, that if he told the truth on the present occasion, they would be returned to him intact, the slight examination already made of them having satisfied Colonel Outram that his account of them was nearly correct. It was, however, from other quarters that Colonel Outram obtained evidence of 1230. some facts which Joteshwar had denied, and in particular of the transmission of 2500 rupees to Bombay, to be at the disposal of Joteshwar himself, but a few days before Nafra's arrest. It is however remarkable, that on Colonel Outram report- 1233. ing that Joteshwar had evidently not told the whole truth, and asking what he should do with these papers, he was directed by Government to return them 1236. unopened, "unless they referred to charges

now under investigation, or establish fraud and corruption against any person now in the service of Government." The emphatic "now" of these instructions was intended to ensure the return of the papers unopened to Joteshwar. Surely Sarabhoy and Brijlal had the faculty of securing the lasting attachment of their friends: or if not, then the only possible conclusion is, that the official body of this part of India was in such a condition that its responsible chiefs did not dare to permit a distinguished and experienced officer of theirs to probe it.

Finding that little aid was to be had from Government, and that the confessions of Joteshwar were not likely to be sufficiently complete, Col. Outram 1230. obtained assistance in Bombay of Captain Barr, Paymaster-General, whom he furnished with a letter from Hurree Bhugtee's Bank (just delivered from Nafra's dominance), directing their Agent in Bombay to show their books to him. In those books 1233. were found entries strongly confirmatory of Joteshwar's confessions as far as he had gone. But all that could eventually be learned was, that Joteshwar had given large sums to Craig; that Cole, a European subordinate in one office, and Ragoba, a native employed in another, were implicated; that Mr. Smith, the brother-in-law of Craig, was suspected; and that the money paid by Joteshwar to Craig could not be traced, from the numbers of the notes in which it was paid not having been preserved. Captain Barr, who assisted Colonel Outram in his Bombay inquiries as his private friend, gave up the 1238, &c. attempt on finding that all the papers passed through the hands of Craig's brother-in-law, Smith; and the Government gave him little thanks for his extra official pains, and much blame for 1259. his withdrawing from this disgusting voluntary service when it seemed so very unlikely to produce any effect. Furthermore, the Government appointed their Secretaries a Committee on this subject, in the beginning of 1852, after further very startling 1259 to 1276. revelations, and some weeks after the dis-

missal of Colonel Outram, which succeeded no better than its predecessors in the investigation.

The private books of Nafra, in Baroda, were seized, as well as those of the bank he managed. It was necessary to effect this seizure through the Gaekwar's Government. More delay taking place than was thought necessary, Colonel Outram sent to learn the cause, and the Gaekwar instantly dispatched one of his own officers, along with the one deputed by Colonel Outram, to Nafra's house. There the Gaekwar's chief of police, Sumbhooram, whose duty it was to make the seizure, was found sitting quietly with Nafra, in a room full of the papers of the latter, who was actually engaged at the time in destroying, erasing, altering, and otherwise preparing them for examination. They were, however, then summarily seized, sealed up, and sent to the Residency, and a committee of native officers, of both Governments, of bankers and bankers' servants, was appointed to examine them, over which Colonel Outram himself presided.

163-25.

1070.
375.

In the course of this examination, surreptitious copies of papers in the Residency records were found, and several matters of importance, evidently intended for concealment, were brought to light. Amongst the latter was a memorandum which, as soon as discovered, was so interpreted by the native committee, from corresponding circumstances of perfect notoriety, to fix a stigma on the character of Mr. W. C. Andrews, who filled, at that time, a high judicial office at Surat, and who, just before the professed date of the transactions noted in the paper, had vacated the temporary appointment of Acting Resident at Baroda. Reading, as the natives read, through the disguise of erasures and fictitious entries, this memorandum, ascertained to have been written at Nafra's dictation by his nephew, seemed to import that considerable sums had been paid by Nafra to natives who were supposed to have influence with Mr. Andrews. The object was

983-E.

37-14.
141-1.
228-3.

variously guessed to be either the obtaining some favour from him while at Baroda, or the influencing his decision in a case before him at Surat. On the former supposition the date must be supposed to be purposely disguised. It may be added that any probable date falls near to that of the first pressure of Joitabaee's case on Nafra's anxiety, that is, just after the abduction of the child. Finding that the matter, at its first emergence to light, was already beyond his own keeping, Colonel Outram sent it at once to Mr. Andrews, in order that he might protect himself against such an use of his name. That gentleman, however, unhappily betook himself rather to defending his native friends, and to blaming the manner in which Colonel Outram had dealt with the case, than to contemptuously disregarding or clearly disproving the imputation. He endeavoured, however, to invalidate the interpretation the examining Committee gave to Nafra's memorandum, and he sent his chief native officer to Baroda to obtain exculpatory information. The latter was a measure which, at the least, was very irregular, and of which, in the opinion of Government given at a later date, Colonel Outram ought to have prevented the execution: the conduct of the native official dispatched on this business, appears, moreover, to have been such as to deprive himself of promotion, and to have required an apology from our Government to the Gaekwar. The correspondence between Colonel Outram and Mr. Andrews, friendly in its beginning, became official in its form, and acrimonious in its spirit. Soon after its conclusion Mr. Andrews died, and Government was thereby relieved of the necessity of judging of more than the conduct of the two parties to the difference. After an attempt of Mr. Bell, one of the Members of Council, to cast severe blame on Colonel Outram (an attempt in exact accordance with the animus of most of his proceedings), the late Mr. Andrews was seriously censured, and Colonel Outram blamed for not examining this allegation (which had

232-9.

232-12.

227.

230.

already got beyond his own power of restraining its circulation) before he sent it to Mr. Andrews. He got credit, however, for "having been actuated by perfect purity of motive, and an earnest zeal, however misdirected it may, in some respects, have been, for the vindication of the honour of the Government and its servants." It was something for Colonel Outram to obtain even so much as this on the very day preceding his removal from Baroda; and its value was afterwards enhanced by the Court of Directors going so much further in approving his conduct in this case as to adopt all the credit given to him by the Bombay Government without joining in their censure.

232-12, &c.
232.
1287.
8-2.

The true facts in this case would probably be of little importance if they were known; but the correspondence which arose out of them renders it strikingly evident that the natives universally believe in the efficacy of Khutput; the whole depends on that supposition.

In the struggles of Nafra, it was not likely that Furkey should escape a blow. It is true the Resident held no intercourse with him, nor had he employed him: but that was more than Nafra knew, or was likely to believe,—especially as Colonel Outram had, soon after his return, been at much trouble to establish the rights of Furkey as a British subject, which had been denied by Captain French. To discredit Furkey seemed to Nafra to be the disarming of one of his chief antagonists; accordingly, as soon as possible after his arrest, petitions were addressed to Government against Furkey in the name of Mahaluxmee, which that lady afterwards disavowed, and attributed to Nafra himself.

1397.
235.
784-27.
520-24.
796.

Furkey had repeatedly petitioned the British Government for their interference with the Gaekwar, in his behalf, and had been as often answered with their refusal. He attributed his present exclusion from employment, the

234-1.
241.
244.

wrongs he had sustained from the Gaekwar's Government, and the animosity against him of the officers of the native Government, to the aid he had formerly given to the Resident in opposition to the favoured cause of Khutpút. He was discredited to this extent in the estimation of the Government, when, about six weeks after Nafra's arrest, a charge of bribery was made against him by a chieftainess of the district in which he had been employed—a charge instigated, as more than suspected, by the Gaekwar's minister. The alleged offence was dated some ten years before the complaint. Furkey had taken refuge under British law, at Bombay, from the further violence he apprehended at Baroda. He willingly returned to Baroda, however, to meet the charge, encouraged by the conviction which the Gaekwar had by this time expressed, that Furkey had been the victim of a foul conspiracy, in the treatment he had received at the hands of his, the Gaekwar's, Government.

253.
248-4. 253. 933-5.
250-11. 292. 245. 247-3.
930-17. 934-1.

Major Fulljames, on whom the investigation devolved after the death of Major Brown, before whom the accusation had been originally preferred, reported not only that there was no credible evidence in support of the accusation, but that Furkey's accusers had attempted to sustain it by means of "perjury" and of "recent and gross fabrications;" and, moreover, "it appeared that a deep-laid plot had been entered into, to effect his ruin, by the present complainant, urged on either in the hope of extorting money from him, or by the ill advice of some of his numerous enemies in this place." He adds that he believes, from the rough notes left by him, his predecessor would have come to the same conclusion. This report is dated 13th November, 1851. Government found themselves compelled to adopt and act on it in December and January following, immediately after their recall of Colonel Outram from Baroda, and to add to it protection for Furkey during

260.
313. 314.

his stay in the Gaekwar's territories. We shall yet see
923, &c. Furkey's troubles are not at an end: fitting fate at British hands for an opponent of Khutput, as far as conformity to usage goes, however the usage is to be accounted for.

It is not necessary to narrate at any length the case
1085. of four native clerks in the Residency of Baroda, deemed unfaithful by Col. Outram, and suspended by him from pay and office in April, 1851, immediately after he made the grave charges against Nursoo, on which we are about to enter. Government allowed their suspension, and in
1089. 1092. February of the following year, after Nursoo was convicted, and Colonel Outram had been
978-5. removed, these inferior servants, strongly suspected of being agents of corruption in a sphere where obscurity of rank scarcely diminishes the power of mischief, were dismissed indeed from the service of Government, in the Residency at Baroda, but in a manner which left them at liberty to obtain employment in any other Government office. Strange contrast to Furkey's fate, who, *without charge or hearing*, was absolutely and repeatedly forbidden Government employment in any capacity whatever!

It will be remembered, that very shortly before Colonel Outram left Baroda for Egypt, on sick-leave, he found it necessary to resort to the aid of Furkey, to investigate some cases in which he had reason to suspect vehemently the fidelity of his Native Agent Nursoo,—that in his Report of 7th September, 1848, he noticed strongly the conduct of Nursoo,—and that in his absence, the Government of Bombay sent a letter, dated 12th January, 1849, to be recorded in the office of the Resident at Baroda, in which Nursoo was defended and Colonel Outram censured. It will also be recollected, that Colonel Outram, who must have found this letter in the office on his return, undertook,
960. 7th December, 1850, to reply to it. It is true, that a year and three quarters had elapsed since the date of the letter of Government, and

that some months before this time, Nursoo had been removed from Baroda to an equally desirable office elsewhere. Under ordinary circumstances, these considerations might have induced most men to let the letter of Government drop, however incorrect the conclusions or unjust the censure it conveyed. But it must be remembered, that Nafra's papers and those of the Hurree Bhugtee Bank had been seized; that the examination of them had produced important revelations; that the *prestige* of Khutput was for a moment stricken in Baroda; that there was not only the duty of very grave investigations before him, but a better chance than had yet appeared of succeeding in that duty; that the chief risk of failure seemed to lie in the tenacious faith in Nursoo and his associates, which still possessed the Government of Bombay; and that accordingly it would prove one of the most effectual strokes in his power, if he could disabuse the Government of its unfounded confidence, and by that means dispose it to a co-operation, without which a battle with corruption must at best be a doubtful enterprize. Nor was he without a just desire that the archives which held the censure of Government on himself, should contain also his justification, however that document might fail of its immediate effect *.

* The subject of one of these disputes affords an example, on a small scale, of the *régime* which prevails over much of India under native Governments. The contrast of the case with the condition and practice of Government in England will supply an approximate mode of estimating the principles from and towards which India is changing under British rule.

A person, here called the Gorajee Pol, held the public revenues of certain villages, and the Government rights over them, on condition of his maintaining twenty-one armed horsemen: he appears, besides, to have had certain direct allowances from the Government. Having got into debt, he pledged his rights in these villages to a banker, on condition that the banker should manage them, and should pay himself a stipulated income out of them. Previous to this pledge, the revenues were leased to the patells, or hereditary head-men of the villages, and the lease was transferred from the Pol to the banker. The patells thus became possessed of the right of exacting all they could from their neighbours, subject, however,

1405. 966. 981. 322.

Government, as we have said, defended Nursoo (12th
966. January, 1849,) partly on the ground that he
968. informed his superior as far as he was questioned by him. But in an office where the chief is often removed, and a confidential subordinate is long stationary, it is obvious that the knowledge of facts must rest with the permanent subordinate, however the chief may be responsible for the use to be made of those facts; and if it be permitted, on authority, for a subordinate so placed, to limit the information he affords to that which may be actually required of him, he has it in his power, by the simplest process of concealment, transposition, or delay, to bring his chief to almost any conclusion he may wish for. The subject is far too extensive for discussion here, but it may be remarked, that the tendency of offices so constituted is necessarily, to a Government really of clerks, screened towards the public by great names:—perhaps an able,

to the overpowering strain which could at any time be put on them by the banker, who held the villages in mortgage. To all this, the British Government, in accordance with the singular arrangements of Guzerat, was guarantee; but by the terms of the arrangement our authority could not be interposed, so long as the conditions of it were fulfilled by the respective parties. But the object of the banker was to ruin the Pol, to incapacitate him from maintaining the stipulated body of horse, and so, on his failure to fulfil the terms of his tenure, to give the Gaekwar's Government a right to resume them.

To effect this object, fictitious statements and suppressions of facts were resorted to, so as to make it appear that the Pol was in debt much more than he could have been if the terms had been observed. Moreover, the lease to the patells was attempted to be set aside practically, by merely avoiding mention of it, and so inducing the consent of the Resident to a new bargain on lower and less binding terms.

One of the two charges against Nursoo, referred to in the text, was his complicity in these misrepresentations, by means of the concealment of papers with which he must have been perfectly familiar. The other, much more serious in its amount, was his connivance at the fraudulent substitution by Nafra of an old superseded bond for a newer obligation of much smaller amount, and the attempt to
1011-3. exact far too much interest; and on this latter charge Nursoo was subsequently convicted by Mr. Frere; on the former he escaped with "animadversion." On both the Government had zealously defended him

but really an irresponsible Government, and, in some important senses, a sham. If this tendency is to be checked, it can only be by requiring the permanent subordinate to give the temporary superior the fullest information on every subject, and not by limiting his duty to the production of the particulars which may happen to be required of him.

962, &c. The reply of Colonel Outram to the letter of Government, (7th September, 1850,) goes into the whole case, paragraph by paragraph, and fact by fact; and it was accompanied by a statement of

1417-83. the facts connected with Joteshwar's corrupt mission, which had been ascertained, in Bom-

950-17. bay, by Captain Barr, and by a Report on the anonymous petition respecting Nursoo, which had been presented nearly two years before. The facts communicated by Captain Barr, already given, we need not here repeat. The Report on

1408. 950, &c. 1012-8. the petition stated that the author of it had avowed himself, and had produced witnesses, who asserted that they were present when Nursoo (Colonel Outram then on sick-leave and Nafra in his glory) boasted of the favour of Mr. Reid, of his contempt for any hostility of Colonel Outram, of his determination to spend as much money at Bombay as was necessary for his own designs, and of the power by which he himself had protected Nafra, and ruined Joitabaee.

These communications, together with the conviction of Nafra, which took place while they were under review, seem to have made some impression on the Government; for the Governor's minute, dated 15th

987. November, 1850, is not so much a defence of the previous decision, as a discussion of the relative duties of Resident and Native Agent, (in which duties as to opinions are strongly confounded with duties as to records and facts,) and a showing that Government had acted according to the information it possessed; that of Mr. Blane goes somewhat further in Colonel Outram's favour, and Mr. Willoughby (who in

those questions is commonly to be found on the side of moderation and right feeling) thought the Resident deserved, in so irksome and painful a duty, all the support the Government could give him, consistently with perfect justice to the accused. The coldness, however, with which the accusations against Nursoo of using
958. Mr. Reid's name improperly were received, was well expressed in the dispatch of 5th November, which directs that no further steps be taken in the matter. Nafra himself, convicted and imprisoned, might well cherish hope from such an order, as seen from his point of view; and so much the more, as
1236. it was dated on *the same day* (5th November, 1850) as the order to return Joteshwar's papers unopened, which were known to contain revelations deeply affecting his old confederates, Sarabhoy and Brijlal. New and greater debates, however, were soon to be set on foot.

1070. 1068. Among the private papers, which the favour of Nafra's friends in office had not given him quite time enough to destroy, was a memorandum of a sum of 20,000 rupees, paid in 1845, to Nursoo. The books of Hurree Bhugtee's Bank were found to confirm, though with some disguise, this more secret memorandum, and personal evidence showed
1074, &c. that the money was actually paid. The object appears to have been, to gain the aid of Nursoo, in an important case, which does not fall within the limits of the present review.

315, &c. In March, 1851, Colonel Outram sent in his Report on Joitabaee's case, and with it the evidence at length. He there clearly and strongly traces Nafra's enormities, as far as opportunity and long impunity contributed to them, to the corrupt collusion of Nursoo, and the mistaken views of Captain
399. 422. French. The Government were evidently shocked by the discoveries thus made to them, and sought partly to invalidate the evidence, partly to screen themselves, under the plea that they had acted according to the information given

to them from time to time, and partly to lay the blame on Captain French and Colonel Outram. We shall have to return to these papers.

It has been stated that the bank of Hurree Bhugtee possessed a treasure-house, locked and guarded, which had not been opened since the death of the late chief proprietor. Besides this principal "jamdar khana," there was a smaller one for the current convenience of the business. In February, 1851, (Nafra having been convicted in the previous October,) it was proposed to submit this smaller treasury to an official examination, partly with a view to ascertain whether, as was generally reported, the embezzlements of Nafra had materially diminished its contents. Singular as it may seem, from an English point of view, both the Gaekwar's and the British Governments were made necessary parties to this examination into the affairs of a private firm, by the British guarantee, which the firm held; they had even to be consulted as to the measures for the future management of the concern.

802, &c.

The keys of this treasury had been kept by Nafra. This unfaithful steward, soon after his conviction, refused to give them up, and they remained with him until the examination, which was made on the 7th April, 1851, by a committee, of which some of the members were relatives and old associates of Nursoo and himself. In the midst of the contents of a large chest, a silver vessel was found, in which, with other small parcels which had been carefully wrapped up, and had evidently long been undisturbed, was one which contained a memorandum in Nafra's own writing and two notes in that of Nursoo. They referred to a bribe of 28,070 rupees "agreeably to agreement," and "on account of the dispute about the boy." The memorandum is dated October, 1848, and contains a reference to a total sum of 78,070 rupees; it states, also, that the sums of 5,000 and 23,070 rupees had been paid to Nursoo on the 19th and 20th of that month. The notes of Nursoo are complaints that the

863. 1066-1. 832-5. 836-1. 1080-B.

1071.

money had not yet been paid him. The date is immediately before the arrival of Captain French at Baroda,—just after Nafra had surreptitiously obtained the signature of the Assistant Resident in charge, to an unauthorized declaration that the British Government would interfere no more in behalf of Joitabaee,—very soon after Government, attributing Nursoo's intention to retire on his pension to Colonel Outram's treatment of him, asked him to forego it,—within a short time of his boast of the friendship of Mr. Reid, and of his own power of Khutput in Bombay,—just when the first court on Joitabaee's case was perplexed and defeated by the firmness of herself and her mother,—and of course, just when Nafra found that help would be needed to neutralize the British justice on which his widowed victim relied.

1391. 1409. 1245. 950, &c. 333. 334, &c.

This discovery was made just when Colonel Outram had already prepared "A Statement of Facts relating to Nursoo Punt, late Native Agent of the Baroda Residency, and now Dufturdar at Ahmedabad," and it forms the subject of a postscript to that report, the date of which is 10th April, 1851, ten days after that of his voluminous report of Joitabaee's history and Nafra's conviction.

1054. 1066. 315.

Ten days still later, Colonel Outram went to Bombay, and finding that his report on Joitabaee's case, and his "Statement of Facts" respecting Nursoo had made an impression on the authorities, such as he had long desired to see, and such, indeed, as he now hoped would be sufficient for future progress, he consented to modify the last-mentioned document, so that it might be recorded in a form less distasteful to his official superiors, without detriment to its intended purpose.

1427-2.

Colonel Outram was called on immediately to frame his accusations into distinct charges on which Nursoo could be tried. He objected that some of the misdeeds of Nursoo were not legal delinquencies, but matters of con-

989-34. 990-35. 991-40. 992-41. 1431, &c.

fidence, and of fitness for his post; and on these, he called for the judgment of the Government in its administrative capacity. He specified, however, two cases of *legal* guilt, (bribery,) in which he believed he could produce evidence sufficient for judicial conviction, if Government first removed the erroneous impressions which prevented the production of evidence, by first disposing of the other accusations. He said, "I consider such measures absolutely necessary to aid me in neutralizing the corruption and intrigue which will be set on foot immediately the intention of Government to appoint a Commission is known." This measure, however, was refused. Government immediately framed all the cases into legal charges, and selected Mr. W. E. Frere, then judge at Surat, to try them. They appointed Colonel Outram prosecutor, a measure which, as the law was then understood, precluded him from giving his testimony in two cases where it was essential. Nursoo thus had the whole apparatus of legal form and chicanery provided for his escape from all accusations, legal and non-legal alike; and these he was left at liberty to use (apparently to the natives, with the favour of Government) in that hotbed of proved corruption, Baroda.

990-4. 994-44.

The chief difficulty, however, in this as in so many former cases, still remaining, viz. that of obtaining willing and truthful witnesses, while the people believed that the Government secretly favoured Khutput, Colonel Outram asked for a decision of Government on other cases of the like character, then pending, in which Nursoo was *not* concerned, so as to disabuse public opinion at Baroda, previous to the investigations, and increase the chances of justice. He says it is his duty; "as their representative at Baroda, to place before them the consequences which will inevitably result from any further delay in disposing of those questions." Government, however, said the papers were too voluminous for them to arrive at a speedy conclusion (although one was the "clear" and curious "Baba Nafra's Bridge".

995-48. 996-50.

case, which they had before them ten months); and so the trial had to proceed under the old disadvantage. Colonel Outram recorded a protest against the whole policy of the trial, and the circumstances which endangered justice; a protest, however, which the results of the trial, although imperfect, were sufficient to render in some degree useless.

791-33. 995-48. 1441-56.

Nursoo was suspended from his office at Ahmedabad, and sent to Baroda, where, however, he arrived and remained with some sort of show, and by no means as a person on trial. The proceedings were authorized and regulated by an Act of the Legislature of India, which had just been passed, (XXXVII. of 1850,) that is, some years after the necessity for it had been so clearly illustrated by the cases of Sarabhoy, Brijlal, and Dowlutram.

993-42. 1443-18. 1443-18. 1016-37.

The charges on which Nursoo was to be tried were as follows:—

1. That he took a bribe of 20,000 rupees from Nafra in May, 1845.

992.

2. That he took another bribe of 28,078 rupees from Nafra in 1848.

3 & 4. That he withheld information in connection with the cases of the Gorajee Pol and Govind Row Gaekwar.

5. That he furnished false information to his superiors in Joitabaee's case.

6. That he instigated Nafra to send a person to Bombay for corrupt purposes.

7. That he made an improper and unauthorized use of Mr. Reid's name, and promoted a belief in Baroda that he had his corrupt favour.

The charges had been drawn by Colonel Outram, rather with a view to substantial accuracy than to legal form: some of the misdoings alleged were capable, from their nature, of little more than inferential proof; the Act which regulated the proceedings had not before been acted upon in Bombay, so that its machinery was untried, and its interpretation,

1428.

in some respects, uncertain; and it was thought, erroneously, as afterwards appeared, that Colonel Outram, as prosecutor, was precluded from giving evidence. These difficulties considerably enhanced others which were inseparable from an investigation, limited by legal forms and demanding conformity to a legal standard, into matters in which conviction was mainly dependent on the accumulative moral effect of many concurrent circumstances. Neither the Gaekwar's officers nor Nursoo's other friends failed to render such aid as they could to the accused by intimidation and actual injury of witnesses, and by refusal to give evidence themselves—encouraged in part, it seems, by a notion that had been some time afloat amongst them, that "a commission" would be sent from Bombay to defeat Colonel Outram's efforts.

1004, &c. 1430-22.

The proceedings, which commenced 11th of June, were terminated on the 22nd of October, by a Report of the Commissioner, in which it was declared—

1441. 1012.

1. & 2. That Nursoo had not been legally proved guilty of taking either of the bribes, but that great suspicion attached to him.

3. That he was guilty of "betraying his trust, by allowing a false claim against Govind Row Gaekwar to be prosecuted before the Resident, knowing it to be so, and withholding from the Resident, documents which would have proved the charge unjust."

4. That on the Gorajee Pol case, he was acquitted.

5. That, in Joitabaee's case, he had not been proved guilty of misleading Captain French (who had taken all the blame on himself), but would have been convicted, if the charge had included his attempting to mislead Colonel Outram.

6. That he knew of Nafra's mission of a person to Bombay, with a corrupt design, and connived at it; but it was not proved that he instigated it.

7. That he did make an improper use of Mr. Reid's name.

Previous to the date of this finding, Nursoo addressed to Government a petition and statement in which he endeavours to weaken the force of the evidence against him. He alleges that he was powerless, friendless, and dejected, while the prosecutor was high in office; that Colonel Outram was misled by his great enemy Furkey; that much art had been employed in concocting charges against him; that much of the evidence was untrustworthy; and that the new Act under which he had been tried bore unfairly in some respects on the accused person. It is remarkable that, in dealing with the two charges of bribery, he alleges chiefly that he had not fair and sufficient means of testing the evidence, and in respect of one of them that Nafra must have embezzled the money himself. When he includes in the persons intimidated into silence against him, the very officer, Sumbhooram, who so quietly sat by while Nafra was doctoring the papers he was sent to seize, it is impossible not to place on all his representations a value as low as Mr. Frere evidently did in forming his final judgment.

1035. 1036. 1038-2. 1037-10. 1039-9. 1037-12. 1016. 1038-3. 1012-10.

The difficulties of the investigation were really in favour of the accused. The general opinion at Baroda was, that Nursoo, not Colonel Outram, was favoured by our Government, and that the Native Agent, not the Resident, would remain in power; and the removal of Colonel Outram in a month after the termination of the trial, shows that the natives had tolerably correct intelligence. It seemed to them safest, therefore, to assist the accused, and the Commissioner testifies to the extreme improbability of Nursoo having had any difficulty in working out the plan of defence he had chosen to adopt. Moreover, it was the impression of Mr. Frere, that under this new Act the prosecutor could not give evidence; a construction of it which has since been said, on the best authority, not to have been intended by its framers, but which at the time prevented Colonel Outram, both from

1442-12.

constructing these charges as he might have done, and from giving his most important testimony on them as they were. We need not adduce further difficulties to show that Colonel Outram had, from the first, little chance of technical success against Nursoo, however he might have the substantial truth in his possession; nor was it likely to do much service either to the cause of justice at the time, or to the sound and efficient working in future of the administrative body of Western India, to pitch the responsible head of an executive office against a suspected subordinate, in the subtleties and chances of a merely legal strife, on questions of confidence and co-operation utterly beyond the coarse and rigid processes of judicial inquiry.

It is most worthy of remark, however, that on both sides the assertion is distinctly and emphatically made that natives of India, in general, will speak according to their hopes or fears from men in power. When a native of respectable station and long experience, on his trial, makes this statement as one of the chief supports of his defence, and makes it more especially in reference to the subjects of native States, it is impossible not to give a degree of weight to it which we should willingly withhold from the opinions, possibly prejudiced, of a foreigner. Here, however, is a fact which suggests the very gravest considerations, as to its causes, its operation, and its remedy, to all who are concerned for the elevation of India.

1038–13.

The Governor's minute, in review of Mr. Frere's judgment, is dated the 6th December, 1851, that is, ten days after the removal of Colonel Outram from his office. The final decision of the Government is dated the 20th of the same month, the other members of council having in the meantime recorded their opinion. The Governor and Mr. Blane, although they diminished the extent of the legal conviction, left so much of it established, and admitted so much "of the gravest suspicions" to attach to the accused in regard of the rest, that they thought it necessary to dismiss Nursoo from the public service,

1018.

1023.
1024.

without a claim for pension. Mr. Bell deemed the result "a great failure" on the part of Colonel Outram,
1025. and would have pronounced Nursoo legally innocent of all the charges together, reserving only some "grave suspicions," against which might be set thirty years of previous good service. He wished to "remove" not "dismiss" Nursoo, a course which would have saved his pension. All agree in Nursoo retaining the village, whose revenues had been given him some time before, for three lives, as a reward for good service as a revenue officer. The formal decision of the Government is much in accordance with the Governor's minute; but how far the reduction by the Government of the extent of Mr. Frere's conviction is justified by the evidence, we have no means of judging, except generally from Colonel Outram's strong com-
1029–12. plaints of their constant leaning to Nursoo, and from their unsuccessful attempt to prevail on Mr. Frere to modify his finding. *For, the Commissioner's full Report is suppressed.* We have things of slight importance given in the minutest detail, and many papers are inserted two or three times over. That this important document, of all others, should not appear on the requisition of Parliament, can give occasion to but one surmise, viz. that Mr. Frere, although he entered on the inquiry with feelings in favour of Nursoo, honestly recorded evidence and his own deductions from it, such as, in the interests of his superiors, would not bear the light. If this is an incorrect inference, the proper authorities can easily show it to be so, by producing the Report.

The Court of Directors, on review of the case, went
18. much further than the Bombay Government in condemning Nursoo, noticed the fact that the culprit had been convicted on a charge which Colonel Outram had made against him long before, but which the Government of Bombay had then set aside, and directed that Government to review their decision as to leaving Nursoo in possession of his enam village.

We now enter on a matter which, although of a different form, agrees with all that has gone before in illustrating the corruptions of Baroda, and the discords of Bombay. It appears that a clerk named Umrutrow Bulwunt, who had long been in the personal employment of the Gaekwar's minister, Bhow Tambeykur*, seems to have brought to Furkey, in April, 1851, a letter, in which the minister traitorously promises to the Gaekwar's brother, Appa Sahib, his assistance in supplanting the reigning prince. The man professed to have been entrusted by the minister himself to deliver the letter to Appa Sahib, and instead, to have secreted under pretence of having lost it. The date he assigns to it agrees with that of strong suspicions of some such intrigue. Being dismissed by the minister, and professing great horror at his enormities, he sought Furkey, who seems to have been at first distrustful of him, and at length to have consented to take the treasonable letter from him, with the precaution of exacting from him an oath to its truth, and a copy of it, written at the time by the man himself. Perplexed by the possession of a document, which after all might be but a trap laid for him, and desirous, if he could, of using it for his own protection against his inveterate enemy the minister, who had instigated the late false charge of bribery against him, Furkey sent the note to his friend Mr. Gregor Grant, one of the highest judicial functionaries in Bombay, in the native depart-

927. 934. 935. 933.

930–17.

* Bhow Tambeykur, just at this time, feared temporarily the success of a domestic party against his own power. The Gaekwar, a young and inexperienced prince, disliked him, but felt compelled to submit to him from a belief of his vast influence at Bombay, partly exercised through Nursoo, who was not yet put on his trial. This belief was confirmed by the disfavour of Colonel Outram with the Government, known through secret channels. The prince believed that the minister could raise his brothers against him without much opposition from Bombay; the minister provided for the continuance of his own power by being prepared, if things came to the worst, to bring another brother to the throne.

934–6. 1168–13.

ment of the law, with a request for advice as to the use he should make of it. It was not long before
925-6. Govind Row Roria, an agent of the Gaekwar in Bombay, asked Mr. Grant for a sight of the note, on which it was shown him. He declared it the genuine handwriting of the minister. Shortly after, Mr. Grant
923. sent it to Colonel Outram at Baroda, who however remained for some time ignorant of its origin. Two months afterwards, the Gaekwar himself asked privately and confidentially to see it: and also requested assistance in tracing its author. The Resident reported the circumstance to Government,
924. whose anxiety, and even wrath, was thereupon turned, not on the traitor or the forger, but on Mr. Gregor Grant, for presuming to meddle with an affair out of his line. The Governor insisted, with some dissent of his colleagues, on Mr. Grant giving up the name of the person from whom he received it, although he had declared that his doing so would place that person in danger; however, this
930. peremptory requisition forced from him the name of Furkey, and along with it his emphatic testimony, the result of long acquaintance, to his high character and the great value of his public services to the British Government. The Governor would have removed Mr. Gregor Grant from his post
931. of Judicial Commissioner in Guzerat; but his colleagues thought it sufficient to censure him, and to forbid him to visit Baroda on his circuits. His real offence seems to have been his friendship for Furkey.

It is to be noted, that on the very day after the Secretary of Government in Bombay wrote to Mr. Grant, *for the first time*, about this treasonable letter,
1109-1. 924. 933. 1160. 930. 1185. 1182. 1184. the minister's secret agent in Bombay apprized him of it. Immediately on finding that the minister was aware of what had been done, Umrutrow took refuge for his life in the British Camp; and Furkey, who had gone to reside at Baroda, on the invitation of the

Gaekwar himself, found it necessary to follow him to the same place of safety. The minister seems to have betaken himself to energetic measures, imprisoning persons until they would give false exculpatory depositions in his favour, and attempting to obtain a forgery of the letter which might be produced as another exemplar of the fabrication to which the letter itself was to be attributed.

939. The Bombay Government rested on the subject, and left it for Colonel Outram's successor. Rumour unhappily says that, in dudgeon at their ill success in these questions with the Home Authorities, and desirous of establishing their own bad opinion of Furkey, they have directed the new Resident to re-open the inquiry as to the origin of the letter. If so, the responsibility must be their own; for Colonel Outram has already shown what stratagems, violence, and perjuries may be expected while Tambeykur is minister, (far more than ever indeed, now that Colonel Outram is removed for opposition to the minister,) and what Furkey may expect as the result.

933-24. 1168-9. 1182-3.

While these events were occurring, and Nursoo's fate, at the hands of Government, was not yet declared, Colonel Outram seems to have received information which decided him to a bold but successful measure. On the 27th September, 1851, he directed the clerk of the British post-office at Baroda to stop all the letters directed for certain persons in Baroda and Bombay, to keep the matter secret, and to bring the letters to the Resident when ordered. Of these persons, the principal were Dajee Dhondeo Sattey, in Bombay, his brother Wamun Row Dhondeo Sattey, in Baroda, and Govind Row Mullar Josee, all of whom were afterwards proved to be in close connection with the minister. In ten days the requisite letters were caught, were delivered to the persons to whom they were addressed, in the presence of the Resident, and were there opened by them. The enclosures showed a system of concealment, and the

1101.

1163, & 3.

contents proved clearly, not only that very extensive and accurate information was given to the minister of such things as might fairly be reported, but correct statements of the latest secret movements and intentions of Government, in important affairs, together with actual copies (making allowance for translations) of the minutes of the Governor and the other members of council. Moreover, there were letters whose calculated obscurity showed that they referred to intrigues in progress, and one amongst them contained careful advice as to the mode of meeting at Baroda the inquiry respecting the treasonable note. The later letters show the effect of the interruption of the earlier, and so establish the authenticity of the whole, in spite of some denials attempted in the first instance.

The Government was vexed at this disclosure, as its measures too clearly showed. It was not to remedies, or even to co-operation in further inquiries, that it directed its chief attention. Its first acts were to insist peremptorily on Mr. Gregor Grant giving up the
1117-11. name of the person who sent him the treasonable note, to call on Colonel Outram to justify an expression in his letter, by giving the in-
1116-10 stances in which his predecessors and himself had apprized Government that their secrets were betrayed at Baroda, and to assure that officer that they were not aware of the interests of their Government having ever suffered by any such betrayal.

Other disclosures followed, from which it appeared that arrangements existed for equally correct and early intelligence from Poona, when the Governor re-
1122-B. mained at the residence near that city; and one seemed to show that this branch of the secret service had existed from the date of Nursoo's leaving the Deccan for Baroda.

But, further: Govind Row Roria, who had been the Gaekwar's agent in Bombay, was in possession, as it will be remembered, of the minister's secret as to
1125-26. his "treasonable note." He was, therefore,
1144-15. kept under strict surveillance from the time

of his return to Baroda, and at length put into close confinement, where he would probably soon be induced to subscribe any statement the minister required. He sent to Colonel Outram an offer to make a full disclosure of the intrigues which had been prosecuted at Bombay, supported by sufficient proofs, provided the Resident would assure him of protection from the ill usage he must infallibly expect if he substantiated the facts. Colonel Outram applied to the Government for authority to give him the necessary assurances, as the *only* means of bringing the truth to light; and he quoted a precedent exactly in point. The answer received was, that Government did not think it advisable to follow the course recommended, but that Colonel Outram was "at liberty to pursue, in this instance, his own investigations at Baroda, by every legal means in his power." The feelings which dictated this answer will be best estimated by remembering that it was given him *immediately after the receipt of his "Khutput Report,"* and its object will be shown by the fact that its date is *four days before his dismissal from his post at Baroda.* The Court of Directors judged very differently of what ought to have been done. They say, "We cannot approve of your having thus arrested *in limine* an inquiry which might have furnished a clue for the detection of mal-practices of the existence of which there is no doubt. It would have been easy to make the pledge of safety to Govind Row conditional on its being found that his information was both correct and of substantial value."

1126-27.

17-8.

The remaining month of Colonel Outram's stay was marked by further revelations. On the 23rd of November he apprized the Government that a mass of original documents had fallen into his hands, which proved that a plot had existed to bribe himself with 50,000 rupees, on his return from Egypt, and Mr. Malet with 10,000 rupees at the same time; that the Gaekwar's minister was its instigator, but that the prince himself knew nothing of it. Government

1127-30.

refused to take any steps in the matter, on the ground that the information given by Colonel Outram was too
1137. vague for legal proceedings; and that the minister was not legally amenable to us for such an intrigue. Colonel Outram wished for security to be taken from him against quitting Baroda, with inimical purposes, as a former minister had done. The Government, however, declined this suggestion also. The chief object of these, as of the celebrated Dackjee Dadajee intrigues of 1843, was the abolition of the Guzerat Irregular Horse*. Here, again, the views of

* The maintenance of this body by the Gaekwar is an obligation to which the State of Baroda is bound by treaty with the British; the cost seems to be about three lacks of rupees, or 28,000*l.* per annum. It must not be supposed that to remit this charge would be so much gained by *the people* of the Gaekwar's territories. The measure of taxation in India is not the necessary expense of State purposes, either under native Government or our own; the rule is, to take all the people can be made to give. In our own territories this rule is applied with more consideration for permanent results and general contentment than at present, or perhaps usually in past times, in most native States; but still the essential rule, as distinguished from our own rule of taxation at home, is the same. So, also, the produce of the taxes is spent, under native rule, on many purposes—the pomp or pleasures of the prince, the support and aggrandisement of favourites, &c.—amongst which, objects of public utility, or the fulfilment of the true duties of a Government, have to take their chance. Under the British despotism in India, the objects on which the taxes ought to be spent are somewhat more carefully kept in view in principle, however the actual administration of affairs may be open to censure in detail.

From this it will be seen, that to obtain the relief of the Baroda State from the obligation of maintaining this body of horse, would be, in fact, to obtain the additional sum of 28,000*l.* per annum for any purposes in which the prince, or minister, or minister's party, might choose to spend it, amongst which purposes the public advantage would stand little chance of attention, and a reduction of taxation would not be admitted at all. Hence the persistent solicitude for the abolition of the Guzerat Horse, and the many successive intrigues to effect it.

Where, as in Guzerat, personal security is so low, that few persons travel, even in the day-time, and for short distances, without arms, it is obvious that a much more prolific source of economy *to the people* would be their effectual protection by law, and by the force of the Government.

the Court of Directors are strongly opposed to those of the Government of Bombay, and in favour of those of Colonel Outram. 17-9.

Passing by other communications which showed how false replies to expected interrogations, in these mischievous but shallow schemes, were concocted, the only one requiring further notice is that of a set of minutes of the members of the Bombay Government, on one particular subject, correct enough to give the gist of opinions recorded by the several members of Council, and to show the differences amongst them. The possession of these occasioned ill feeling and difficulties for a period of three years; the Governor, however, insisted that these intrigues, and others which he admitted to have been well proved to exist, had done little or no harm; and that we had no right to find fault with Bhow Tambeykur, the Gaekwar's minister, for he had only done the best he could for his master. Moreover, the correspondent who resided at Baroda was no subject of ours, and so we could not even arraign him; and he who lived at Bombay we could not punish, because, although we have a law against taking a bribe, we have none against giving one. All we could do was to take better care of our papers in our own offices. Better excuses for Khutput, in the mouth of a Governor, it is hardly possible to imagine. 1139. 1160. 1166-51.

Colonel Outram had to feel, in some of his very last acts at Baroda, the effect of the system he was endeavouring to destroy. He had asked the Gaekwar's Government for the attendance of certain witnesses he required, and the sending of them seemed likely to proceed in the usual way, when suddenly the Gaekwar himself, evidently under the minister's dictation, assumed an entirely new tone, and required that Furkey, who could have had nothing to do with the question, should be given up to him, as a Gaekwar's subject, or at least removed to a distance from the British camp. The object was evidently either 1171. 1169.

that the minister might rid himself by violent means of Furkey, or that the damaging revelations then in progress might be stopped by Colonel Outram's refusal to surrender Furkey. The opportunity and the courage to venture on such a course were supplied by the information which the minister received on the night of the 27th, of the determination of the Government to remove Colonel Outram, which was only expressed in minutes at the earliest on the 22nd, and only carried into effect by an official act on the 27th, the very day the minister was informed of the resolve: the clandestine intelligence evidently was founded on the private minutes, not on the public act. It is quite in keeping with such a policy that the minister threatened, coerced, and imprisoned all who were required, either by silence, forgery, or falsehood, to screen himself from the charges of bribery which Colonel Outram, in consequence of the evidence recently obtained, openly made against him to the Gaekwar himself, as well as to his own superiors.

1170, &c. 1175. 1176. 1168–12. 1169–17. 1284. 1285. 1287. 1169–17. 1177.

The last letter of Colonel Outram before quitting his post of the 15th December, was to warn Government of the coming intrigues of the minister by describing the preparations for them, and to record his conviction of the integrity of Furkey and of Soorujram, which in respect of both had been often and most severely tried. He describes Furkey as left in imminent personal danger from the vengeance of the minister; and Soorujram as living in continual dread of false accusations which were known to be always in preparation against him in some form or other, and as seriously ill under a conviction (reasonable in the eyes of a native of India) that he was suffering from witchcraft*. Colonel Outram solemnly places them, in his final

1183. 1170–19. 1183. 1184–11.

* A firm belief in the power of witchcraft is sufficient to produce all the injurious physical effects on the natives of India, which are

paragraph, under the protection of the Government he believed they had so faithfully served.

The Resident left Baroda after an interview with the Gaekwar, in which that prince declared, as he had done a few days before, his unfeigned regard for, and reliance on, him, distinctly separating his own personal feelings and wishes from the conduct of his ministers and advisers.

1481.

Let us now briefly review the facts which made up the general aspect of Khutput to the people of Baroda, at the date of the fall of its untiring opponent, and of his departure from amongst them.

The Government, immediately after Colonel Outram's dismissal, appointed a committee in Bombay, which, after an unsuccessful pursuit of the trace afforded a year before by Colonel Outram and Captain Barr, luckily fell on a document in the box of a Mr. Marston, an assistant in the Secretariate, on a salary of about 80*l.* per annum, who was proved by independent evidence to be guilty, if at all, of correspondence with the very parties, whom Colonel Outram had been enabled to point out by means of the letters intercepted at Baroda. The proof against him is by no means clear: but suspicion in his case was deemed enough for dismissal, (and indeed justly so,) while the severest legal test of guilt was required in the cases we have narrated, when the great dealers in Khutput were concerned. There is an inference to be drawn from the comparison, which the people of India could hardly be expected to avoid.

1193, &c.

ascribed to the incantations themselves. Accordingly those persons who maintain their influence with their countrymen by pretending to this power, seldom resort to stronger means with natives than such as deal with the imagination. But when Europeans are to be operated on, who are not under the influence of such a belief, frequent small doses of secret poison are employed. Probably very few such cases actually occur. Colonel Outram himself has twice suffered in this way; and it is said that Mr. Bettington, whose report contributed to the issuing of the Khutput circular, has been permanently and seriously injured by this diabolical means.

Nafra was indeed in prison; but with a
905-3. 906-4. 906-note. fraudulent mitigation of his sentence by his friends in the Gaekwar's Government. He had been proved by the books to be indebted to the firm he so mismanaged little short of 40,000*l.*;
855. besides valuables he had taken without stint or record, and moreover besides a deficiency in the treasury he jealously kept under his own charge,
833. which, in the absence of accounts known to have been abstracted by him, could not be
859. estimated at less than 70,000*l.* in jewels, and
860. 861. 835. 50,000*l.* in money. Yet he was still bold enough, even in his prison, to refuse accounts, explanations, and the keys of his former
1446-33. 1298. charge: he was honoured by the Gaekwar's minister with usages applying only to the principal native gentry; he sent large sums of money to Bombay for Khutput purposes; he was free and hopeful enough to engage in fresh schemes for swearing
901. away Joitabaee's rights, by affirming on purchased oaths, that the child the medical committee declared she must have had was born in Bombay; his neighbours still held a faith nearly as strong as ever
834. in the power of his Khutput in that city; and when either "compunctious visitings," or some hopes of future advantage, led him to contemplate
317-9. a full confession, he was still cheered and rendered firm again by hopeful intelligence from his friends in Bombay.

834. Joitabaee, childless, was left with a scanty maintenance for a person possessed of such
799. 862. rights as hers, and she remained burthened with debts incurred in her support and defence. Her fellow-wife and herself are left by our
864. Government, which professes to guarantee them, and has so often interfered in their affairs, to recover the defalcations and abstractions of
863. Nafra by the ordinary practice in respect of unguaranteed persons in Baroda; even the promise of the eventual review to which the guarantee

and usage entitle them, being *expressly* omitted;—that is, they are left to apply without appeal, to a body composed of, and ruled by, Nafra's firm, powerful, and now triumphant friends. 866.

Nursoo, after conviction, was dismissed to the retirement he had himself purposed to apply for, befriended to the last by a strong attempt by Mr. Bell to save his pension for him, and a successful one, for a time at least, by the whole Government, to preserve his village.

Furkey, after taking refuge in the British camp from the vengeance of the Gaekwar's minister, excited by his services to the British Government in the detection of Khutput and the defeat of its objects, and after being honourably acquitted of every charge which at intervals had been most perseveringly made against him, seems to have followed Colonel Outram to Bombay, where "his manly but melancholy air" ought to have seconded the still stronger consideration that he was now ruined for his faithfulness, according to his own prediction some years before. His only remaining protection seems to have been a letter from the Court of Directors, establishing his right as a British subject. 1400. 1390. 33.

Soorujram, dejected, harassed, and sick, awaited with fear the machinations of the friends of Khutput, unless he could remove from beyond their range.

Govind Row Roria, who was in possession of the minister's secret as to the treasonable note, and had offered revelations to Colonel Outram, was in prison. Umrutrow, who had given important facts, was a refugee, in fear of his life.

The minister was in full enjoyment of power, his prince being evidently greatly under his control; the administrative body (the Durbar) was composed, for the greater part, of persons who had been discarded with disgrace from the employment of the British Government. 1308.

Colonel Outram, one of the most distinguished po-

litical officers the Government had at its disposal, was dismissed, not only to the triumph of the corrupt minister he was opposing at the moment with unprecedented effect, but at the very juncture when the clearing up of those disgraceful mysteries, so long sought by him, was just within his reach.

In estimating the force with which this contrast would strike the public of India, it must be remembered that there appears to have been little suspicion amongst the natives that corruption could be made to influence the *local* British officers—the reliance was always on Khutput *at Bombay;* and the coincidence is remarkable, that while, on the one hand, every successful effort to bring corruptionists to justice was made by local officers, often without authority from Government, and almost always without their encouragement, so, on the other, almost every measure, whether for the discouragement of investigation, the palliation of evidence, or the mitigation of punishment, came for years together from Bombay. The ultimate conviction of Brijlal, Nursoo, and Nafra, the natives would deem exceptional cases, to be attributed, as they attribute all reverses, to the ill-luck of circumstances. Not a whit the less do they retain their belief in the normal and abiding influence of Khutput; nay, that belief has been confirmed by the total effect of all recent events.

Before confining ourselves to the questions between the Government and Colonel Outram, we must here review the controversy which arose on the case of Joitabaee. The Report of the Resident is dated 31st March, 1851, six months after the conviction of Nafra (October 22nd, 1850), after much confirmation of Joitabaee's pretensions to maternity had been obtained by a committee of medical officers, and after much foul play on the part of Nafra and his friends in the Durbar, had been exposed by the Reports of Mr.

319. 535. 690. 676.

Gregor Grant and his Sheristadar on the falsification of the depositions.

Colonel Outram's Report exhibits the entire history of the case: it reviews the conduct of all the parties in it, the British and Gaekwar's Governments included; it quotes at length the most important papers; and it shows how great was the apparent reason the people at Baroda had to believe that British justice had been hoodwinked by Khutput. We have already given, at as great length as our limits allow, the substance of this voluminous paper, with references to the original evidence for the facts it embodies.

392. Mr. Willoughby, in a minute dated on the very day of his resigning his seat in the Council (28th April, 1851), expresses, with evident concern, the grave opinions which, in the brief time permitted for his perusal of this Report, he had felt himself compelled to form. With all his experience of Guzerat, he seems amazed at the extent of the villany revealed; and he calls on the Government he is leaving to show by what means they had all been led to treat as "a wicked impostor" and "an impudent deceiver," a woman who now seemed to be "the injured victim of perhaps as foul and nefarious a conspiracy as was ever hatched." He can only conclude that Colonel Outram and Captain French kept them in ignorance; laying much the greater blame, hypothetically, on the last-named officer, and clearing himself as much as possible by reminding his colleagues that he had at the first objected to the appointment of Captain French to the post of Resident at Baroda. His brief but expressive annotations on Colonel Outram's report not

393, &c. only betray a strong conviction of the truth of the Resident's conclusions, (on the reserved hypothesis, indeed, that the accompanying depositions were accurately represented in the Report,) but go much further than Colonel Outram had done as to the right of the British Government to control the inquiry, and even to carry on an original and indepen-

dent investigation into so serious a case *. In every respect, these annotations strongly contrast with the querulous complaints, and timid but cunning casuistry,

* The guarantees on which is founded any right of the British Government to interfere to the extent Mr. Willoughby would have advised, or, indeed, to interfere at all, are evidently much prized, even yet, by subjects of the State of Baroda, although their original objects have long passed away. The immediate occasion of these singular engagements was as follows. The Gaekwar of that day was deeply and hopelessly in debt; and amongst the most serious of his obligations were the arrears to the Arab mercenaries, who at once impoverished the country, and starved from the poverty they created. The prince, like many Indian princes, had little credit, even with his own subjects; and the bankers, although wealthy enough for the purpose, would not advance the sums necessary for the pay and discharge of the Arabs, except under such a guarantee of the British Government as we have already described. The necessity for that guarantee arose in this way;—so long as the Arabs were dependent on the bankers for advances of money in absence of their pay, they were as much the soldiers of the money-lenders as of the prince; but if once these needy foreign swordsmen were got rid of, the bankers would have no protection against the prince's will: and to supply this protection they required the British guarantee.

It is obvious, however, that this could be only one particular in a more general condition of things. The state of the country when the guarantees were first given, is shown by the resistance then commonly made by villages to the levying of the taxes of the year, until the native Government had given formal security not to oppress them,—by the prevalence of raids from the neighbouring mountains and forests, by which black mail, often to two or more disputing parties over the same ground, had been established as customary right,—and by the arrangements made by Sir John Malcolm for paying stipulated sums to these recognised freebooters through the British authorities, in preference to suffering them to overrun the land with their indefinite demands.

It seems strange to us that, on any consideration, a Sovereign should permit, such a participation in his sovereign powers, as is involved in the operation of these guarantees. But in truth, the Gaekwar practically gained much more of sovereignty than he lost, as the total effect of the arrangements which so let in our interference. And even more; the fundamental idea of Oriental sovereignty, that of property, not of office, was by no means violated in principle, but only diminished in the amount of its practical result, by the standing disorders which formerly kept down the revenues, and resisted the power of the prince. The change from such troublesome and costly disorders, to the permanent and regular interference of the British, was, on the whole, a great gain to the

of the minutes of the remaining members of the Government. His chief anxiety is to know how Government was so lamentably misled.

The Governor's minute is dated 10th November, 1851, six months later than Mr. Willoughby's. In the interval, Nursoo had been convicted; Mr. Andrews had been involved in a discreditable suspicion—perhaps, however, not very well sustained; Furkey, who had warm friends in Bombay, and equally warm enemies in the Government, had been most honourably acquitted of new charges; and Colonel Outram, by a "vigour beyond the law," had obtained vexatious evidence of high play in Khutput. Nafra himself had active friends at the Presidency. The minutes on Colonel Outram's Joitabaee Report are dated within a few days of his removal from the office of Resident at Baroda.

The Governor's minute complains that Colonel Outram openly "proclaims his fears that Nafra's influence should be exercised on the Government, and lead to their mitigating his sentence;" and, while he cannot refrain from according to Colonel Outram the unqualified approbation of Government, for the sympathy he has shown for a "persecuted woman, for the protection which he has extended to her, and for the contest which he has sustained in her behalf, with all the corrupt influences of a native court," he complains of the terms in which Colonel Outram has addressed the Government; of the inferences which may

399-6.

397-8.

400-9.
400-21.

Gaekwar at that time, however distasteful the interference may have become in these quieter times.

The present narrative leaves no doubt as to the reasons for which the persons who possess these guarantees desire to retain them. It seems clear that their value lies in their mitigating the tyranny which is elsewhere the ordinary consequence of our protecting an Indian prince against its common corrective, rebellion. They thus involve us in duties of which we cannot easily divest ourselves until the same effect can be provided for in some other way; and we have other considerations to take into account, besides our own inconvenience, before we withdraw from obligations of this nature, which we have taken on ourselves, and from which the beneficiaries are evidently unwilling to release us.

be drawn from his statements; and of his having put
400-23. Government on its defence. He says that Colonel Outram has, moreover, sought to influence Government in a purely judicial proceeding,
401-25. by a consideration foreign from justice, viz. a regard for their own endangered reputa-
401-31. tions; that he is altogether wrong when he complains that Government have not supported him; and that Government have always acted
401-32. correctly according to the information they possessed at the time, Colonel Outram himself, as well as Captain French, having failed to inform them as he ought.

402-35. As to the belief in Khutput, he treats it as a notion so thoroughly Asiatic that it is in vain to struggle with it; but he does not show how it happens, even on Asiatic principles, that large sums should be spent on Khutput, *for many years together*, if it always seemed to fail; nor does he show that the fixity of the native belief in Khutput exempts the Government from taking care of their own measures and reputation in respect of it.

405-66. His Lordship mistakingly blames Colonel Outram for leaving India without a caution on the case to the Government, or a summary to guide
406-77. Captain French; he blames Larbaee for refusing her full evidence to the Gaekwar's Court which she so deeply distrusted; he gives a narra-
395-22. tive of the case, with comments, to show that Government had always acted up to its
409-99. knowledge; he blames Captain French severely on grounds to which we have already
411-100. adverted, and partly excuses him for shrinking from a dictatorial duty towards "the favoured and trusted of the prince," to whom, however, in fact, the prince was in bondage all the time. He says
411-111. that but for the lucky revelations made to him, Colonel Outram might have succeeded no better than Captain French; not remarking, however, that the fault of the latter was his so neglecting to use

the means within his reach, that, but for these revelations, even Colonel Outram could not have remedied the consequences; and then follow these two remarkable paragraphs, which, as if still to show how little Government was disposed to support an officer fighting with corruption, were communicated to Colonel Outram only through the Blue Books.

411-114. "I now turn to the case itself, which, the more it is studied, must, more and more, impress the mind with admiration of the extraordinary ability and patience displayed by Colonel Outram, in investigating the obscure and secret conspiracies which are the subject of his Report, dated 30th March, 1851, in baffling native intrigue upon its own ground, and in unravelling with much ingenuity, if not always successfully, the frauds, perjuries, and the mass of contradictory depositions which have been taken and committed, from the period when Larbaee's first petition was presented to Government in 1847, up to the date of Baba Nafra's trial and conviction in August, 1850.

"The task he undertook to perform may indeed be termed an extraordinary one. Once persuaded that Joitabaee's tale was true, and that she was the victim of a foul conspiracy, he has, alone and unaided, stood by her, has opposed the active machinations of her powerful enemy, deriving a strong support, as they must have done, from their success with the Acting Resident, and through him with this Government, has openly met the secret hostility of the Baroda Durbar (for the Gaekwar himself, however well meaning he may have been, has been evidently and wholly passive in the matter), and finally unveiled and exposed the domestic treachery of the Native Agent, which would appear to be but too clearly established by the facts and reasoning of this report. The Commissioner's proceedings will, however, enable us to decide this point with certainty."

412. The whole question is made to turn, both by Lord Falkland and Mr. Willoughby, on the single point of Joitabaee's maternity, to which his Lordship next addresses himself. He admits the veri-

similitude and consistency of Joitabaee's story, as well as the apparent title to credence afforded by the attendant circumstances; but he assigns six reasons for doubting its truth, none of which seem to be of force, and some of which it is strange should be advanced at all after the report of the medical committee. Let it be remembered, that in the interval between the reception of the Report and the date of the minutes on it, the Government had sought and obtained a still more emphatic opinion, with facts, from Dr. Davey, on whom the personal examination of Joitabaee devolved.

690. 821.

The six reasons of his Lordship, with our remarks on them, are as follows:—

1. Joitabaee, married at eleven or twelve years of age, lived with her husband till about the age of seventeen without having a child; it is thereupon inferred to be improbable that she should have been a mother at last.—But surely there are like instances enough within the knowledge of almost every person, even where youth and immaturity do not, as here, postpone the probability of maternity; and, singularly enough, the incidents of Joitabaee's married life are paralleled, as nearly as possible, by those of her fellow-wife, Mahaluxmeebaee.

412. 771.

2. Joitabaee had a strong interest in making out a story, true or false, that she bore a child to her late husband.—No doubt she had; but this only shows that she *might* have told a falsehood, not that she *did* tell one. How would it have been possible for Joitabaee really to bear a child under the circumstances, without having this strong interest in the fact? The argument would have applied just as much to her fellow-wife as to herself; for be it observed, that the age of the child, and the recognition of it for three years, would have been no defence against a perjured allegation that it was originally spurious. Mahaluxmee, according to this reasoning, may have imposed a spurious child on her husband. She had as

412.

great an interest in doing so as Joitabaee had. To such absurdities does this argument conduct us.

412. 3. There were peculiarities, which do not often occur, in Joitabaee's health during her period of pregnancy.—But the medical committee 695–16. showed beyond doubt that they were only peculiarities, and not facts inconsistent with actual child-bearing.

412. 4. Her husband was in a state of health for some time before his death, which rendered it unlikely that his wife should bear a child to 693–11. him.—This argument the medical committee, for medical reasons, wholly reject. Besides, if we may for a moment subject Joitabaee's good name to an hypothetical scandal (which we believe would be utterly without support from her own conduct), the question is not as to her husband, but herself. An adulterine child is as good as a legitimate one, for all legal purposes, until the adultery is proved; and nobody has attempted to prove adultery against her, although Nafra, at two different periods, seemed to have contemplated a perjured resort to the device. We do Joitabaee some wrong in using her name in connection with such an argument.

412. 658. 5. Joitabaee was brought to bed at her father's house.—But this was clearly according to the custom of her caste. The only inference drawn from this by his Lordship is, that the place was favourable for imposition; it will not bear the inference, without which the fact is wholly immaterial, that imposition was actually practised. But what if she had resorted to any other place for her accouchment? Would it not then have been said that the departure from usage was to facilitate imposture? What is any person to do, who is equally accused, whether he takes a given course or that directly opposite?

412. 6. Joitabaee's husband, it is said, did not know that she was *enceinte;* and Joitabaee was

afterwards excluded from caste for having surreptitiously brought in a low caste child.—The evidence to show that the husband did not know it, is confined to two considerations; the first is presumption from certain provisions in his pretended will, a document of which it is highly probable he never knew the contents; and the second, a certain symbolical placing of Mahaluxmee's son on Joitabaee's knees, which may easily be accounted for by the uncertainty of her having *a son*, and that to survive, although she were known to be *enceinte* at the time. A miscarriage, (as had previously happened to her,) the birth of a daughter, or the early death of a son, must all have been probable contingencies in the mind of the dying banker, and would naturally lead him to wish that, in any case, his only son should care for both his widows. The affection of Joitabaee, evidently the stronger-minded woman, he might well wish to gain for the advantage of Mahaluxmee's son. As to expulsion from the caste, Lord Falkland argues as though people at Baroda went about their business as safely and independently as in Bombay, and as though nobody had had experience of Nafra's qualities, and of his means of exercising them; and surely the account given by the caste people themselves, of the strong-handed manner in which Nafra gave them just what representation he pleased as to Joitabaee's child, and then took their conclusion on it, is quite enough to show that no argument was to be founded on the widow's exclusion from caste, even if her subsequent restoration had not fully admitted the error of the expulsion.

488–3.
488–4.

655–30.
324–*.

898–192.

It is worth remarking, parenthetically, that if Mahaluxmeebaee had been the stronger-minded woman of the two, so that Nafra had had a greater interest in getting rid of her than of Joitabaee, most of his devices would have suited the case of Mahaluxmee as well as they were made to apply to that of the other widow.

Lord Falkland then goes into the arguments in favour

of Joitabaee, giving less weight to them than Colonel Outram had done; but admitting at last "that if it were his own duty to decide judicially upon the evidence which has been transmitted to them, and no other were procurable, his verdict would be in her favour." The remainder of his minute is occupied with disparaging the evidence, and with suggesting a theory of the case which assumes both Joitabaee and Nafra to be guilty; the
420-165. latter first conniving at, then imitating, and at last exposing the imposition of the former, as his interests at the time seemed to dictate. He says
421-167. that this is quite as probable as that Joitabaee bore a son to her husband! yet he is compelled to admit in the next few lines that even the
421-169. Gaekwar's minister, Nafra's firm friend and confederate, had been forced by evidence to confess his belief that Joitabaee had had a son.

422-4. Mr. Blane echoes the Governor's doubts, and limits the proved guilt of Nafra to the abduction of a child of some sort. He censures Captain French, and would not interfere to mitigate Nafra's sentence.

422-5. Mr. Bell concurs, on the ground that the Gaekwar's court were the best judges.

But we cannot so dismiss the case. The medical committee say that Joitabaee had certainly borne a child. Nobody of credibility accuses Joitabaee of licentious conduct, much less of having actually borne a child other than as she herself alleges, and as the persons ordinarily most likely to know affirm. The
550-2. Gaekwar's Punchayet say that Joitabaee did *not* procure a child from Meetapore. The last-mentioned body say that Baba Nafra "laid a
544. most villainous and diabolical plot against the wife of his master who had been so kind to him." The village of Amleeara was so completely
506-8. under Nafra's control (even to the death, if its inhabitants be credited), that it would have been madness for Joitabaee to resort there for

a spurious child, in the face of the power of Nafra and of the jealous interests of the son of her fellow-widow, and yet, after the emphatic decision of the reluctant Punchayet that she *did not* procure a spurious child from Meetapore, it must have been from this impossible Amleeara she procured one, if at all.

Lord Falkland had before him these strong reasons for concluding that she could not have procured either from one village or the other a spurious child. They were remarkable corroborations of the natural probability that the child which she possessed for twelve months was the genuine product of her own maternity, corroborations obtained by means of searching, and, for the most part, very hostile investigations. And yet his Lordship, in the entire principle of his minute, insists on putting Joitabaee's case on merits of positive proofs; he calls upon her in fact, as far as he can, to prove that her child was her husband's, and he but reluctantly admits any evidence in her favour which is short of that. But is it not clear that the burden of proof rests here with the accuser? Why should Joitabaee be called on to prove that which, in the case of every other well-conducted woman all over the world, is taken as true, and is rightly so taken? For, of the hundreds of ladies in England who have borne posthumous children, how would any one of them fulfil the requisitions of Lord Falkland's justice? Why was this strange measure dealt out to Joitabaee? Was it because she is only a native, or because she was an opponent of Nafra? Was it the pride of European caste, or was the Government earwigged by the subtleties of some emissary of Khutput *.

* Lord Falkland thanks Mr. Grant Lumsden, the Judicial Secretary, for "his important assistance" in this case,—that is, in drawing up this lawyer-like minute. The business rightly belonged to the department of Mr. Malet, whose long experience in the affairs of Guzerat might have been supposed to qualify him especially for its consideration. Mr. Malet's signature authenticates the letter founded on the minute. These facts may show how acceptable counsels may sometimes be obtained, and how incorrect it may be to attribute the opinions of an official document to the functionary whose only concern with it may have been to sign it.

423-7. The Secretary's letter to the Resident is of course nothing more than the minutes in another form; with this exception, however, that *the commendatory paragraphs before mentioned are omitted.* It is dated 1st December, 1851, that is, five days after the letter removing Colonel Outram from Baroda.

867-7. The late Resident did not sit down quietly under this letter, either as to the censures on himself, or as to the faint conclusion in Joitabaee's favour, which might easily let in future doubts, to be stimulated by new perjuries into a reversal of the present unwilling decision. In the midst of the vexation and fatigue of his removal, he prepared a vindication of his Report, addressed to the Government, 12th June, 1852, in which he reviews their arguments, proves how mistaken had been their apprehension of the facts, and shows how inconsistent with each other are their admissions and conclusions.

We need not here give an analysis of this document,

906-8. nor of the reply of the Government, since they do not materially add to the facts already exhibited. The occasion drew from Colonel Outram a full re-statement of the case, which, being made after objection taken by Government, meets successfully the difficulties most likely to be raised, and doubtless did much to obtain the subsequent adoption by the Court of Directors of his views in this case, notwithstanding the reply of the Government.

902. 855. The postscript to this Vindication must be noticed for its exposure of Nafra's peculations, to which we have already referred; for the statement it makes, that Nafra's punishment was greatly mitigated surreptitiously; and for the warning it gives,

863-3. 863-4. 864-6. that the letter by which the Government had stripped the widows of the customary aid of British protection in recovering Nafra's abstractions, left them exposed to the will of their unfaithful steward's now unchecked confederates, and satisfied the people more than ever of Nafra's power of Khutput in Bombay.

And as to the incidental facts, Colonel Outram affirms that he did no more than his duty when he used the strong language to which Government object, and that he gave Captain French ample information of the state of the case on his leaving for Egypt, which the Government do not admit. From the whole tenor and spirit of the minutes of the members of the Government, indeed, it may be concluded, that if Colonel Outram had not employed strong language, as well as vast labour and careful arguments, Nafra would have had an excellent chance of a mitigation of his sentence, to be popularly attributed again to Khutput; and, moreover, while it is doubtful whether Captain French would have made any use of such a *résumé* of the case as Government censured Colonel Outram for omitting to leave behind him (which, by the way, must have then passed through the hands of his treacherous Native Agent to Nafra himself), it is certain that Captain French did not himself use the records of the office with even ordinary effect, nor did he the letters and petitions which he himself received.

9-5. The Court of Directors (2nd June, 1852) express a strong conviction of the innocence of Joitabaee, and of the enormity of the injustice done her. They add, it is greatly to be regretted that oppression, so odious and long continued, should have been practised without our interference where our protection was due;—that the Government of Bombay, however, with their information, could not have interfered more than they did;—yet, nevertheless, that Colonel Outram has cleared himself of all blame connected with the early stages of the inquiry (that blame which the Bombay Government had laid on him), while "the ultimate success is wholly attributable to his exertions."

We now follow chiefly the course of Colonel Outram, and of his controversies with the Government. The dismissal of that officer from his post at Baroda took place on the 27th of Nov., 1851, within six or seven

weeks of the conclusion of the trial of Nursoo, and in less than a fortnight from the reception by the Government of his Khutput Report. His dismissal is attributed by the Government not to the Report itself (which, however, they had evidently read), but to the letter which accompanied it. Colonel Outram defended his letter, as well as his Report on the case of Joitabaee,
867. which the Governor had also assailed. On
the 12th of February, the late Resident me-
1315. morialized the Court of Directors against the censures of the Government; at the end of that month
1319. the Governor and his colleagues recorded minutes on the memorial; and by the middle of the following month the whole case was dispatched to the supreme authorities in London.

Of the contents of the Khutput Report, a judgment
1340. may be formed from the present abstracted narration of the events which it more copiously details and discusses. The letter which accompanied it, and on which the dismissal of Colonel Outram was ostensibly based, is in substance as follows.

1279. The Resident states that the Report has been delayed by his waiting the issue of circumstances which were strongly confirming the belief in the efficacy of Khutput, and which to a certain extent he had already reported on;—that he completes the narrative to the date of the Report, and has incorporated in the document his original protest against the mode of dealing with the case of Nursoo, on the ground of the probability of its want of effect;—that he has endeavoured to be at once faithful to his duty and respectful to the Government;—that the point reached by the evil demands from him very decided language;—that his difficulties at Baroda have been greatly increased by the conviction, universal at that place, that he was in disgrace with and opposed by the Government, and that the object of the course taken towards him by the Government was to get rid of him;—that an influence so diminished was ill fitted to cope with the bold and unscrupulous minister, who, possessing a most injurious

influence over the prince, opposed effectually all plans of reform promoted by the Resident;—that collusion existed between this Minister and Nursoo, which was concealed by artful appearances;—that, had he possessed the confidence of his superiors which he once enjoyed, he should have advised the Gaekwar at an early period of his residency to select another minister;—that, feeling such a course would probably not be supported, he had been obliged to be content with what he could accomplish by means of outward appearances of cordiality and content;—that he conceives he has a right to be allowed to relieve himself from this position by an exercise of authority with the native prince, such as few other Residents in India would hesitate to exercise;—that, if Government will not give him authority to do this, he will nevertheless remain at his post, although from climate, as well as from repeated tampering with his life, it is one of danger to him as well as difficulty;—that, while sick and weak in Egypt, the intelligence he had from Baroda, although little exact or definite, together with the steps taken by the Government of Bombay, led him to apply to the Governor-General for employment elsewhere, in order that he might be in direct communication with the Supreme Government as he had been aforetime;—that he afterwards withdrew his request as inconsistent with that unflinching devotedness to duty, which on every occasion had been his rule of action; that he is more than ever resolved to labour for the vindication of great principles;—that, knowing his departure would be the signal for great intrigues and oppressions, he will remain at his post, although Government should not give him the power which he thinks needful for removing its difficulties; that, if Government have sufficient confidence in his political qualifications and his honesty to credit his statement, he will transmit a memorandum exhibiting the hostile proceedings of the Minister, which, however, the apprehension or cupidity of all who could give testimony obliges him to refuse to prove while the Minister is in power; that his embarrassments with the Govern-

ment of the Gaekwar are not of his own seeking;—and that to what they are owing will best be judged of from the accompanying Report.

1283. On this letter, the Governor, in about a week after its arrival, recorded a minute, in which, after noting the bulk of the Report, and deferring the consideration of it, he says the letter which accompanied it was "so extraordinary in its style and tenor as to require immediate notice;"—that Colonel Outram had formed a very erroneous idea of his duties as Resident and of the relations of the British Government with regard "to the independent sovereign and friendly neighbour" the Gaekwar;—that he proposes the removal of the Minister, without definite charges, and merely because he does not like him;—and that such a step would be regarded as "a most wanton and cruel act of aggression." The Governor further says, that Colonel Outram overstepped the intention of the circular of the 15th May, 1850, to which his Khutput Report relates;—that his "honest ardour" in pursuit of the eradication of Khutput would not have been blamed if he had stopped there, however strong the doubts of his success;—and that, but for other things he has said, it would have been sufficient to caution him that his course was likely to embroil him with the Gaekwar for an object which could best be effected by means of better care at home. He says that Colonel Outram seems to charge the Government with having failed to support him;—to complain that he is thus made a mark of calumny and reproach;—that he nevertheless remains at his post;—that he assumes he has lost the confidence of his superiors, and that he bitterly complains of his position;—that, since it now appears that Colonel Outram has ceased to identify himself with the objects and policy of the Government, and seems to suppose he has some independent authority of his own, the Governor is convinced he cannot with advantage continue in his post of Resident at Baroda; and, moreover, it appears that he is labouring under impressions incompatible with "the tact, calm-

ness of mind, and discretion, indispensable to the maintenance, on a satisfactory footing, of our political relations with the Baroda Government;"—"that much embarrassment will ensue if he be permitted to remain there;"—that he "would therefore inform him that the letter under review, taken in connection with previous correspondence, has convinced us that it will not be for the advantage of the interests of Government that he should continue to represent them in Baroda."

1284. Mr. Blane agrees with the Governor, and anticipates evil "from the Quixotic design Colonel Outram has conceived of eradicating what he imagines to be the popular belief of the efficacy of indirect influence through the corruptibility of Government officials, though in reality, it is to be feared, under the instigation of Baba Furkey and other wily intriguers, who are seeking to turn his monomania to advantage in the attainment of their own ends."

1285. Mr. Bell "fully concurs."

The Resident was accordingly desired to resign.

1295. To the letter founded on these minutes, Colonel Outram replied, (15th December, 1851,) in the same letter that conveyed the resignation which had been required of him. He showed that, contrary to the allegations of the Government, he had acted on a correct knowledge of the relations of the British and Gaekwar Governments; that the views he had expressed as to the removal of the minister were in accordance with those relations; and that he had brought distinct and specific charges against the minister. He showed that the Honourable Mountstuart Elphinstone, in 1821, and Sir James Carnac, in 1841, had insisted on the expenditure of the revenues, the choice of a minister, and the general course of the Government, being always subject to the approval of the Resident. He cited the letter of Sir George Arthur to the Gaekwar, in July, 1843, on occasion of the Dackjee Dadajee intrigues, in which he reproves that prince with some sharpness, for having thought

that reports prejudicial to a high character for integrity were unworthy a great Government, and assures him that the British Government is so jealous of its honour in this respect, that it had instituted rigid inquiries, and would punish the guilty parties; and still further, charging the Gaekwar with being backward in aiding these investigations, he told him he should lay the case before higher authorities, the effect of which step it was impossible to foresee; and he exhorted him to avert the consequences by the fullest disclosures, and by excluding from his councils the men who, for their participation in these intrigues, had already been excluded from the Residency, amongst whom, we may incidentally notice, was this very Baba Nafra, the hero of so much of our story. Colonel Outram further quoted the reprimand given at the same time to Mr. Boyd, the Resident, for not having taken steps, under very similar circumstances, more vigorous than those Colonel Outram had asked and been refused authority to take; and he forbears to quote other opinions and precedents exactly supporting the course he had taken. He proceeded to state the specific charges which he had at various times made against the minister, and which he had stated with all the plainness he could, although always with the caution inspired by the certainty that the minister could obtain all or any of his reports if he pleased; that he had placed in the hands of Government, proofs of the complicity of the minister with the treachery in their own secretariate; and he assured them he could obtain further proofs, if only a sufficient precedent, which he adduced, were followed in affording the needful security to the informant; that, directly in breach of treaty, the minister had associated with himself, in official capacities, persons who had been discharged in disgrace from the British service, and that these persons constitute a majority of the official body. He argues, that neither a just interpretation of our treaty relations with the Gaekwar, nor an accurate knowledge of the facts of the case, nor a due reference to his own official

career, would have led the Government to stigmatize his proposal as "a most wanton and tyrannical act of aggression against a compliant and unoffending ally;" and he says, that while, on the one hand, he hoped that his earlier exposures of the misconduct of the minister would have led the Government to milder measures, which, taken in time, would have saved the minister from direct censure, he was, on the other, compelled at a later period, by the course of the Government itself, to recommend a dismissal of the minister as the only means of stopping a career which might, at no distant period, require and justify the absorption of the Baroda State. As to the censures on his Khutput Report, he says that the materials of that document are merely the details and results of investigations which necessarily occupied him in the course of his other official duties; that the composition of it was effected in hours abstracted from recreation and repose; and that only an intense conviction of its being his duty, led him to place again before Government such a mass of disagreeable revelations. He says he never entertained a Quixotic design of rooting out corruption from amongst the natives of India; but he did hope to be supported by Government, in showing that high British functionaries were incorruptible; that failing, however, like some of his predecessors, to receive that support, he was deprived of his just and necessary influence, made an object of adverse boastings, treated with rough disrespect even by British officials, and put in danger of his life. For the truth of all this he refers to his Khutput Report, and his Report on the case of Joitabaee; the Government, too, had long known it, and yet had given no sign of help or approval. He defends himself against the accusation of having supposed he had an independent authority, while he claims to have apprized the Government, in the strongest possible terms, that owing to their own measures he had in fact neither influence nor authority at Baroda, except as far as he could personally command it. He declares his intention of appealing to the higher authorities, not

against his removal, but against the reasons given for it; and stating again how confident had been the predictions of the corruptionists of his recall or death, and how great their triumph now the former had been accomplished, he foretells their deep revenge (already in preparation) on those who had escaped or thwarted them, to be followed, he believed, in the course of God's good providence, by a signal and perhaps not
1308. tardy retribution. As an Appendix, he gives a list of the individuals, discarded for bribery and misconduct by the British Government, who were then, contrary to treaty, employed as the principal administrators of the Baroda State*.

1309. The Governor's minute, on this letter, is dated 26th January. It denies that the precedents quoted by Colonel Outram are applicable; asserts that the question between them was not whether the Gaekwar was under obligation to appoint a minister in accordance with our wishes, but whether the Resident had a right to call on him to do so without having special directions to that effect from his own superiors; that if proofs were supplied to the satisfaction of Government, that the minister was acting in a manner dangerous to the welfare of the Gaekwar State, or inimical to British interests, there would be no hesitation in calling for his removal; that Government never intended to impugn the diligence or good faith of Colonel Outram in the slightest degree; that the censure of Government on Mr. Boyd in 1843 is not an applicable precedent, inasmuch as that was occasioned by his want of decision in fulfilling specific instructions

* The superintendent of military and police, the superintendent of finance, the law adviser, the chief of the city police (Nafra's friend Sumbhooram), the minister's personal assistant, and several others, had been discharged from the British service for misconduct, and, in the majority of cases, for bribery. Among them are Dadoo Punt, of whom we have seen something; Hurreelal, the immediate
30-6. predecessor of Nursoo, as Native Agent at Baroda; and Madhoolal, once Native Agent at Sadra, of whom the Court of Directors wrote in 1842, that he had been far too leniently treated.

from his superiors; that Colonel Outram's dismissal was not occasioned by his Khutput Report or its contents, but by his avowal of his want of similarity of feeling and objects with the Government he served, by the position in which he had placed himself with the Gaekwar's Government and its members, and by the consequent loss of the tact, calmness, and discretion which his post required; that although Colonel Outram never said he did not regard the Government with respect, it is impossible to draw any other conclusion from his correspondence; that the plain meaning of his words was, that he had an independent right to advise the Gaekwar to dismiss his minister; that his removal, whatever evil may result from it, is of his own procuring; that he hopes Colonel Outram's representation of the state of things at Baroda is exaggerated; that, whether so or not, they may have confidence in his successor; and that it is not necessary to communicate further with him.

1312. Mr. Blane, the next day, says that the letter of Colonel Outram shows the unfitness of his remaining; adverts in the same sense as the Governor to the case of Mr. Boyd; says that "supposing him to believe in the origin he assigns to the popular conviction of the efficacy of Khutput, it ought to be evident to him that his placing himself in direct and unbecoming opposition to Government could only result in his exposure of such want of concert as inevitably to afford strength to what he pretends to be seeking to eradicate;" and that Colonel Outram's real motive was his vexation at the censure passed by the Government on his proceedings in the Gorajee Pol and Govind Row Gaekwar cases, and the approval then given by Government to the conduct of Nursoo, which, however it may since have been shown to be mistaken, did not justify Colonel Outram's "tone of attack and exaggeration." He then recommends that a summary of the whole case be prepared for the use of the Court of Directors.

1312. Mr. Bell concurs, while Sir John Grey, Commander-in-Chief, disclaims participation

in the proceedings or opinion on the case, on the ground of his absence from Council.

1315. On the 12th of February Colonel Outram memorialized the Court of Directors. After stating that his former experience had deeply impressed him with the evils arising from the belief in Khutput, and that he had hoped that the Government at Bombay were at length prepared to support measures for disabusing the native mind of that pernicious persuasion, he says that he entered on his duties at Baroda with a fervid hope that he should be able to achieve much good for the people and their sovereign; that his plans proved to be useless so long as it was believed they could be frustrated by corruption at the Presidency; that the vindication of the purity of the British name thus became one of the earliest and most imperative of his duties; that he failed in convincing the people of Baroda that the Government of Bombay could not be bought; that occurrences which strengthened the native belief are detailed in his Khutput Report; that that Report did not awaken the Government to the necessity of giving aid to the vindication of their character; that soon after the delivery of that Report he was removed from his post; that he believed he was following out the policy which had been marked out by former Governors, and which remained unchanged on the records; that while his Report necessarily dealt with strong and disagreeable facts, he endeavoured, both by himself and by the aid of experienced friends, to divest them of everything which could be deemed offensive or disrespectful; that if he had failed in doing so, he begs it may be attributed "to its true cause, a strong sense of duty, and an inability to soften without diluting truths, which he deemed it his bounden duty to present in unweakened force."

1319. The Governor recorded his sentiments on this memorial, on 28th February, to the following effect: He recapitulates in brief Colonel Outram's statements; admits Colonel Outram's former services and merits; says that the state of the hill

country of Baroda, fifteen or twenty years ago, has nothing to do with the present question; that whatever the corruption at the court of the Gaekwar, we had nothing to do with it; that the Resident's duty was mere advice, the effect of which must be derived from moral weight, without the exercise of active control; that, at any rate, he ought to have consulted Government, without whose authorization, for all his acts, he had no power; that his Khutput Report will be considered in due time; yet that it was not for that Report he was dismissed, but for the letter accompanying it; that Colonel Outram makes an inadmissible distinction between appealing against his removal and appealing against the reasons assigned for it; that the Government were under no obligation to render a reason to him at all; that the whole is now to be left, as it safely may be, to the judgment of the higher authorities; and that if Colonel Outram and his friends tried to divest his reports and letters of everything disrespectful, they did not succeed.

1322. To this Mr. Blane (28th February) adds, "I consider Lieutenant-Colonel Outram's removal to have been forced upon us by his persisting in proceedings dictated by the sentiments evinced in the letter attached to his Khutput Report, and not solely by the inditing of that letter."

Mr. Bell "most fully concurs."

23. 26. These various documents were sent to the Court on the 3rd February and 15th March, 1852; the letters and summaries transmitting them added nothing to the expression of opinion or the statement of facts.

27. The Court of Directors, on the 26th June, 1852, replied in a letter which, setting aside Mr. Blane's addition to the reasons for the removal (1322: 28th February), on the ground that Colonel Outram does not appear ever to have "persisted" in measures he had been instructed to discontinue, states that he had over-estimated his powers in supposing himself entitled to advise a native prince to dismiss his

minister on his own responsibility, and without reference to his own Government, and would have been liable to severe displeasure if he had done so *;—that the general tone of his correspondence, and not exclusively the letter accompanying the Report, had no doubt occasioned the Government to determine on his removal;—that he had believed himself unsupported by Government in his exertions to detect corruption, and the supposition that his exertions were viewed with dislike, appeared to him to defeat his efforts;—that he had failed in respect to the Government in his correspondence;—that the Government ought to have called on him at an early period to retract improper expressions; and, "in conclusion, we give to Lieutenant-Colonel Outram credit for the zeal, energy, ability, and success, with which he prosecuted inquiries attended with great difficulty; and taking this view of the case, we express our hope, that when Lieutenant-Colonel Outram shall return to India, you will find a suitable opportunity of employing him where his talents and experience may prove useful to the public service."

Reduced to their elements, four reasons are here assigned for the removal of Colonel Outram:—

1. That that officer pursued a course, in respect of corruption at Baroda and Bombay, different from that approved by Government.

2. That he had incorrect views respecting his powers as Resident, and had acted in pursuance of those views.

3. That he had embroiled himself to such an extent with the minister and other officers of the Gaekwar's Government, as to have lost the tact, calmness, and discretion necessary to the fulfilment of the duties of his post at Baroda.

4. That his language to the Government, his superiors, was disrespectful.

These reasons require examination.

Where a habit of dishonesty of any kind prevails, two courses are open in respect of it: 1st, to resist

* Which he never did; he expressly *asked leave* so to advise the prince.

and expose it whenever it affects our own interests or proceedings; or, 2ndly, to bear with it, satisfied with the total result, although that result be diminished by this adverse influence. Colonel Outram, when he first went to Baroda, had nothing but the previous proceedings, as recorded in the office, to show him which of these lines of policy the Government had adopted; for it does not appear that he was officially informed of any change in the views of his superiors, if such a change had then taken place;—the only guide given to him by the Government was the spirit of the past transactions. If he had been apprized of a change, it might have been a question with him whether he would accept the appointment. Now, from the conduct of Sir George Arthur's Government, in the recent and notorious case of the Dackjee Dadajee intrigues, as well as from all that had previously taken place, it seems impossible to come to any other conclusion than that the established policy was that of tracing out and exposing corruption in all cases where it affected ourselves, and not the contrary one of conniving at and enduring it.

1296-12.

The chief error of the Government seems to have lain in not perceiving, or probably in being unwilling to confess even to themselves, the change in their own counsels which had really taken place. The evidence of such a change is to be found in the remarkable contrast of Sir George Arthur's letter of 18th July, 1843, with the minutes of Lord Falkland and his colleagues, dated 7th December, 1851. The former says, that as to the alleged insignificance of *reports* tending to cast doubt on the purity of the British character, "it is my duty to undeceive your Highness. The British Government is extremely jealous of its high character for honour and integrity, and its complete freedom from all taint of corruption; hence it regards the offence of Dackjee Dadajee as one of the greatest magnitude, its effect being to create a belief that justice was to be bought and sold, and that corruption prevails at the very gates of Government. It behoved Government, therefore, when his wicked ma-

1296.

chinations were discovered, to institute the most rigid inquiries, with the view of dispelling the false accusations he had disseminated, and, if possible, of punishing all parties implicated in the transactions." Sir George Arthur then proceeded to say, that he should lay the whole case before the superior authorities, and to advise the Gaekwar, most earnestly, to dismiss from his councils all persons concerned in these intrigues, and to reveal all he knew of them, as the best means of averting the possible extreme consequences of such attempts to represent the highest British functionaries, "as capable of being influenced in their official acts by pecuniary considerations."

1166. Lord Falkland, on the other hand, who had before him, at the time, an accusation against the minister, of an offence not a whit less grave than that of Dackjee Dadajee, and related to the very same object,

1127, &c. —an accusation supported by evidence which would have ensured conviction from any British jury, and following upon others as serious as this, deems the possession by him of surreptitious copies of private minutes of Government, no ground whatever "for proceeding against him;" he thinks it not necessary to call on the prince, after the example of Sir George Arthur, for aid in obtaining additional information, but contents himself with saying, "it will at all times, I imagine, be extremely difficult for us to attempt to define the exact point at which the conduct of a minister acting (ostensibly at all events) in the interest of his sovereign, with whom we are intimately connected, becomes criminal towards us, by endeavouring, by indirect means, to make himself acquainted with our wishes and intentions."

Mr. Blane is equally ready to excuse the minister; and Mr. Bell, as usual, concurs *.

* It is only just to the Government to state, that at a later period they did enunciate somewhat different views; but this
908-27. was after the Nursoo, Joitabaee, and Khutput Reports had done their work, and much too late, either to guide Colonel Outram, or to save themselves, for it was after that officer's removal.

If, then, connivance, or, at least, quiescence, were to be the new policy, the change ought to have been made known to the Resident, before he was blamed for departing from the views of Government; and the more so, as such a change was one of the last a British officer, who had had long experience in dealing with the natives of India, would have expected.

Moreover, neither did Colonel Outram, at any time, hesitate to fulfil the wishes of the Government when made known to him, nor did he, in any one instance, go out of his way to seek occasions of contravening their policy. Whenever the powers which he applied for were refused, he dropped such of his plans as were dependent on them; and he certainly applied oftener and on smaller occasions than any officer would have done who felt himself supported by his superiors. So, also, every case which he followed up had first met him in the direct path of his duty, without his going aside to seek it. Nursoo was a public servant whose unfaithfulness came under his own eye and affected his own duties. Joitabaee was under British guarantee, and had vehemently invoked its protection. Nafra's papers, seized in Joitabaee's case, made the inquiries in the case of Mr. Andrews and of Nursoo imperative. The stoppage of the letters at the post-office was in consequence of information spontaneously sent to him; and so of all the rest. There is not a single accusation either officiously sought out, or beyond the duty of a responsible British officer. Colonel Outram had done nothing more than he was bound to do; only, however, with this to be said about it—an officer, content so to act, might have done it in form only: he did it in spirit. The first reason, then, assigned by the Government, is plainly contradicted by the facts; if Colonel Outram is to be judged either by the inherent proprieties of the case, or by the means he had of judging of the views of the Government.

The second reason, viz., that he held incorrect views of the extent of his powers as Resident, is justified almost exclusively by the following paragraphs in his

1281-14. letter transmitting the Khutput Report: "Had I been on those terms with my own superiors to which in former days I had the honour to be admitted, as well by the local as the supreme Governments, I should, at a very early date of my intercourse with the minister, have pointed out to his Highness the necessity, for the honour of his own Raj, of selecting another adviser; in doing this, I should have done no more than any other Resident in India, in a similar position, would have deemed himself justified in doing. I should have been rendering an essential service to the Gaekwar, and I should have diminished that intrigue and corruption which tends so much to compromise the character of the British Government in the eyes of the natives.

"But I felt keenly that I was not admitted to that confidence and kindly consideration on the part of Government which it was once my honour to enjoy. I feared that my conduct might be censured, and that my recommendation might be unsupported; and in such a case I was well aware that intrigues would multiply, and attempts be made to involve me in a dispute with the Durbar, with a view to lead to my removal from a post where I am a source of inconvenience and alarm to the traders in corruption."

These expressions and those of the following de-

1286-6. pendent paragraphs, which are no stronger than these, the Government interpret to mean that Colonel Outram believed himself endowed with an independent power; and it is somewhat strange, considering the natural construction which the words evidently bear, and the general fairness with which the Court of Directors have treated the whole controversy, that that body should have admitted this charge into the slight and qualified censure with which they ac-

27-6. companied their acknowledgment of Colonel Outram's merits in this particular service. The real sense of the passage is easily shown.

It is clearly understood in our Indian policy, that the influence of a Resident of ours at the Court of a native

prince is to be exerted, in ordinary circumstances, and always in the first instance, only in the way of seasonable advice, enforced by such moral weight as the character of the Resident, and of the Government he serves, can supply. The object is, to render all acts both really and ostensibly the acts of the native Government; and only to prevent mistakes or suggest good measures by the quiet and private influence of the Resident, his influence being guided, of course, in its exercise, by the views of his superiors. Lord Falkland expresses the same thing in these words. 1321-10.

"The British Resident is not placed at Baroda as a governing power, nor is it consistent with his duty to interfere with the actual Government of the country, further than by exercising a personal influence, which may enable him, without direct and visible interference, to sway the councils of the Durbar for the benefit of the people and the interests of the British power which he represents." Only when the native court is bent on measures prejudicial to its own interests, or to ours, and will not listen to the Resident, is the Government called on for its interference; an interference necessarily official and peremptory whenever exerted at all.

But the Resident cannot suppose his mere advice will have any practical effect, adversely to the inclinations of the native Government, unless he can rely on the Government he serves for the adoption both of his advice and of all its consequences, if necessity should arise for a formal appeal to their authority.

Now, Colonel Outram plainly tells the Government of Bombay, in the extract above given, that he could not venture on the first premonitory step of privately advising the Gaekwar to dismiss his delinquent minister, because, judging from their own recent acts, and not a few of them, he could not rely on their ultimate support of him in doing so; and because, if they disavowed or counteracted that advice after it was given, matters would be in a worse condition than before. He then goes on to say that he has met this difficulty, for the time, in the best way he could; he urgently

asks from the Government the needful authority to make this recommendation, with the security against counteraction to be derived from an assurance of their concurrence; and he finishes by saying "that should Government not concur with me in this view of the case, I shall respectfully submit to their decision; for I feel that it is my duty to remain at my post, one of difficulty as well as of danger as it is."

So far, then, from this being a declaration that he possessed any independent authority, it is an express avowal of deference, carried further than any other Resident in India would have carried it, in a case where, as here, such a Resident might see that the prince's own interest, independent of ours, was involved in the measures he intended to recommend.

The real offence of these paragraphs probably lay in the opposite direction, although the Bombay Government might be but obscurely aware of the nature of the impression made by them on their own minds. They expressly lay the state of things at Baroda, in as far as no effectual remedy for it was attempted, at the door of the Bombay Government itself.

The third reason assigned for the removal of Colonel Outram is, that, while labouring under his avowed impressions, as to the corruption of the native Government at Baroda, and the want of support from his own Government in combating it he was likely to experience, "he could not possess the tact, calmness, and discretion indispensable to the maintenance, on a satisfactory footing, of the political relations of this Government with the Baroda Durbar, and that much embarrassment would ensue if he were permitted to remain there." 1286-7.

It was easy for the Government, in the comparative quietude of Bombay, to set up a standard of "calmness" altogether unfit for the very different circumstances of Baroda. It requires but little discernment to see that whoever may, at any time, make much impression on the corruption of that city, by any kind of means left in the power of the Resident, must do so by an

energy as little compatible with a reputation for calmness, as that here ascribed to Colonel Outram; and the happiest thing of the kind that can take place will be, that some man should chance to be appointed, whose just indignation at what he must necessarily witness, should be so combined with "tact" and "discretion" as to give him the means of carrying some sense of right and wrong, or, at least, some dread of retribution, as far as we are bound to interfere, into that far-gone city. Be it remarked, however, that it is not said that Colonel Outram has ever been actually deficient in either "tact" or "discretion," nor would it be easy to find proof from his acts that he had been. It is only said that he must be so; and because it is so inferred, he is removed: and, more strange still, in Lord Falkland's minute, on the Joitabaee Report, dated but a fortnight before the removal, that nobleman, the Governor, expresses "his admiration of the extraordinary skill and patience displayed by Colonel Outram, in investigating the obscure and secret conspiracies which are the subject of his Report, in baffling native intrigue on its own ground, and in unravelling, with much ingenuity, if not always successfully, the frauds, perjuries, and mass of extraordinary depositions" which had occupied and polluted the three previous years. Surely the qualities which form the topics of this eulogy are altogether incompatible with the want of tact, calmness, and discretion alleged a fortnight afterwards as the reason of removal; and if this refers to proceedings then some time past, those proceedings were of a kind quite as likely as those which followed, to exhibit any real want of the necessary qualities of a Resident, nor were those later proceedings any other than such as might be expected from a beginning like the Joitabaee investigation.

411-114.

The particular practical difference which drew this remark from the Bombay Government was Colonel Outram's proposition to call for the removal of the Gaekwar's minister. To this the Government made two untenable objections: 1st, That Colonel Outram

advised it only because he had a bad opinion" of the minister, while, however, he had "not brought specific charges, even assumed to be capable of proof, against him;" 2ndly, Such a measure, when directed against "a compliant and unoffending ally, could but be regarded as a most wanton and tyrannical aggression" on the "independent sovereign and friendly neighbour, at whose court Colonel Outram was Resident."

1285-3.

Now, although it is true that in the particular letter then under review, Colonel Outram did not bring specific charges against Bhow Tambeykur the minister, it surely ought not to have escaped the Government that the Resident's letters and reports had, for a long time, been full of charges against him—some very explicit, and others clearly implied. From amongst more general accusations, we may take the following as too precise to be deemed insufficient for further action, and too important to be easily forgotten:—

1. An attempt to bribe Mr. Malet and Colonel Outram himself for the abolition of the Guzerat Horse, sent in with ample evidence on the 23rd November, 1851; followed up and confirmed on the 2nd of the next month.

1127.

1148.

2. An intrigue to effect the same object by bribery in Bombay; in fact, a repetition of the Dackjee Dadajee intrigue. This was stated and pursued, with offers of evidence and suggestions of measures for obtaining further evidence, in communications of the four following dates:—13th October, 1851, para. 18, page 1101; —8th November, page 1125;—2nd December, paras. 2, 3, 4, and 5, page 1167; and 13th December, page 1143. The last document, indeed, was sent in after Colonel Outram's dismissal, but it is fairly included here, since it refers to an investigation which, in the words conveying the censure of the Court of Directors, "was arrested *in limine*," but which would otherwise have amply convicted the minister. The first three communications are, however, quite sufficient for the present argument.

17-8.

3. The conspiracy to ruin Joitabaee Settanee, a lady entitled to British protection. This conspiracy extended to the members of the Gaekwar's governing body; the minister was the chief of that body, and without him nothing could have been done. These things were asserted over and over again by Colonel Outram, in his papers and in his final Report on the case; they were even fully admitted at length by Lord Falkland, in his minute of 10th November, 1851—a fortnight or so before Colonel Outram's dismissal,—in the following words: "The task" Colonel Outram "undertook to perform, may indeed be termed an extraordinary one. Once persuaded that Joitabaee's tale was true, and that she was the victim of a foul conspiracy, he has, alone and unaided, stood by her; has opposed the active machinations of her powerful enemy, deriving a strong support as they must have done from their success with the Acting Resident, and through him with this Government; has openly met the secret hostility of the Baroda Durbar (for the Gaekwar himself, however well meaning he may have been, has been evidently and wholly passive in the matter); and, finally, he seems to have unveiled and exposed the domestic treachery of the Native Agent, which would appear to be but too clearly established by the facts and reasoning of this Report." It must be observed that the "Baroda Durbar," *i. e.* the Gaekwar's governing body, could not have been concerned in any "conspiracy" or have indulged in any "secret hostility" without its chief, the minister.

411-115.

4. The oppressing and intimidating of the witnesses against Nursoo Punt, when the case of that native official was investigated by Mr. Commissioner Frere. Several distinct acts of oppression were stated by the Resident to the Gaekwar personally, (June, 1851,) and afterwards reported officially to the Government of Bombay, who acted on the Report. Let it be remembered, this was a charge, with circumstantial instances, of an attempt to obstruct justice in

1005.

an inquiry into the conduct of one of our own subjects, confidentially employed by our own Government.

1101. 1163. 5. The systematic corrupting of the Bombay Secretariate, proved by means of the letters seized at the Baroda post-office and other evidence.

6. Besides the above, which were stated with distinctness equal to that on which Colonel Outram was called on to frame charges against Nursoo Punt, there was another and last accusation, which Lord Falkland singularly enough made the means of ignoring all the rest. In his letter of 31st October, 1851, that which accompanied his Khutput Report, and was made the ground of his removal, Colonel Outram explicitly charges the minister with proceedings hostile to his investigations; he says he can prove the facts, but he will not do so while that minister remains in power; because, however the witnesses may be able or willing to tell the truth if left to themselves, they will not do it if left exposed to the minister's vengeance by his remaining in power; nor did he feel himself justified in calling on them to incur the risk. This fear, we may remark, was not only reasonable, from what the minister had already done of the same kind, and such as universal experience in the East would inspire, but it was in this case made more intense and efficacious than usual by the unanimous belief, at Baroda, that Colonel Outram was acting in opposition to the secret wishes of his own superiors, and would soon be set aside, or in some way deprived of power to protect any witnesses he might call. These considerations were so much the more urgent, as they applied to subjects of the Gaekwar who had no British guarantee, and who were therefore exposed, without remedy at our hands, to any degree or kind of intimidation or revenge the minister might choose to employ.

1282-22.

The avowed indefiniteness of accusation and withholding of proof, which clearly applied only to this last charge, were made by Lord Falkland and his colleagues

to apply to all those which had been advanced before, of which proofs had been pressed on them for weeks, and in some cases for months, together. If it be not fair to say that this was a trick of the Government, let it at least be admitted, that some officer should be accountable for reading up their papers for them, in order that errors so glaring as this may be prevented.

The practical weight of this allegation, that the Resident called for the removal of the minister without distinct charges, was made to fall on the fact it was adduced to prove, viz. that the Resident was embroiled with the Gaekwar's Government. But taking the word Government in the sense of the governing body, without including the prince, it is important to ask, whether any man can fulfil the duties, or ought to occupy the post, of Resident at Baroda, without becoming embroiled with such a minister and Government as Colonel Outram found there? We venture to affirm, that the difficulty arising from being on ill terms with the Durbar was much more chargeable to the Government, which failed to end it by supporting the Resident in the discharge of undoubted British obligations, and equally undoubted duties of his own, than to the Resident, who laboured to fulfil both one and the other, at the necessary risk of the embroilment.

2. The other reason of the Government for objecting to the proposal to require the dismissal of the minister is equally unfounded. That dismissal, which treaty authorized us on occasion to require, would have been as real a relief to the Gaekwar himself, as to any of the victims of oppression, his subjects. The sources of the minister's power were his own natural strength of will, his close connection with the party of bankers and others, who, as Captain French had said, ruled the Gaekwar's Government; but far more than all, the Gaekwar's confirmed belief that his minister had a great secret influence at Bombay. Nothing could have so strengthened the prince's persuasion and have so straitened his bondage, as to learn, through secret emissaries, that, after all the accusations and proofs sent

against his minister to the Government of Bombay, that high but (to him) suspected authority had determined to let him remain. Had the minister been removed at the behest of the Bombay Government, the Gaekwar would have rejoiced in his own liberation, while the British character would have been vindicated, and the Khutputists, for a time at least, disarmed.

Nor let it be overlooked that the offences charged against the minister were precisely of the kind which Lord Falkland said would have been considered, by the Government, to justify them in calling on "their compliant and unoffending ally,"—"the independent sovereign and friendly neighbour," the Gaekwar,—"to dismiss his obnoxious servant, and to conform to the advice of the British representative in appointing another." For, as we have already seen, they were just such "as to compromise our interests and those of his prince, and to endanger the welfare and safety of the Gaekwar State," to the greatest extent that the position of the minister permitted, by any means short of actual hostilities. They were offences against that integrity and good name of our own highest officers which are the very foundation of our power; they were desperate attempts on the security, wealth, and life of persons we were bound to protect; and they comprehended the actual corrupting of our own native civil officers, and the defeat of justice when the conduct of those officers was under investigation. As if, too, this was not enough, this minister was charged with effecting much of it through the debasement of the Gaekwar's own courts of justice. Now surely nothing could be more inimical to the continuance of the Gaekwar's rule, than to show it to the public of England in the character of a Government so thoroughly demoralized that our protection, on which its existence depends, could no longer be afforded to it without our perpetuating the most revolting wrongs. The danger in which the minister thus placed his prince, was, indeed, far greater than his offences against ourselves.

1309-5.

We pass now to the last reason assigned by Govern-

ment for this removal of their Resident, viz. the want of respect in his language to them, more particularly
1284. in his Khutput letter, but also in his other correspondence. In this they are supported by the Court of Directors, with however the most im-
27-9. portant reservation, that reproof and a call for retractation at an early period would have been the proper remedy, and not dismissal.

Mr. Blane attributes this disrespect to Col. Outram's vexation at the erroneous censure by the Government, of his early complaints against Nursoo. But that officer
1377. had used quite as strong language, years before, on the escape of Khutputists, when there had been no previous censure to bear the blame of inspiring it, and when he had not yet acquired a reputation on which he might rely for obtaining credit for his views against the preconceptions of Government; but then the Government of Sir Robert Grant, to which that language was addressed, was so occupied with public views as to give little heed to the incidental irregularities of an "honest" care for the purity of the British name; and accordingly Colonel, then Captain, Outram was neither censured nor removed. It is, however, still more remarkable that in this very matter of Nursoo's misconduct, adduced by Mr. Blane as the
1426-1. stimulating cause of this disrespect, Colonel Outram, not many months before, had shown his desire to say what his duty bound him to say, in the softest terms the case admitted, by withdrawing disagreeable expressions when he saw that his public objects were likely to be accomplished without them. It was only at last that energetic, perhaps irregular, remonstrances, required by facts still more galling than they, were forced from him by continued frustrations of his efforts to vindicate the honour of the service, and by sickening denial of the support of his own superiors against the corruption which openly boasted of having bought them *. But why was Government so sensitive

* The Government frequently say, in their later minutes, that they *did* give Colonel Outram due support; but they never show when and how they gave it. Now, to say nothing of the *manner* in

to the strong language of their own officer, when still stronger was constantly applied to them by the public press? why care so much for that which need not have passed beyond their own knowledge but for the treachery which he combated in Baroda, and they let alone in Bombay?

Here, again, we may ask, was it possible, consistently with his duty, for Colonel Outram to make such statements as he had to make, in a manner not liable to be mistaken for disrespect? He had to show his superiors the consequences of errors they had fallen into for years together, to exhibit the corruption which had fattened in an important native State on their imputed corruptibility, and to describe the grievous oppressions

which important cases were disposed of, let the effect of the following instances of *delay* be considered.

1. A charge of fraud against Hurree Bhugtee's Bank, reported 30th July, 1850, was not replied to at all by the Government up to the date of Colonel Outram's removal, sixteen months afterwards. This is one of the cases in which the Resident had appealed to the Court of Directors; the papers were sent to the Court after a delay of thirteen and a half months, when appeal was practically useless.

2. Nursoo's complicity with Nafra's attempted fraud, re-stated by Colonel Outram to the Government, 7th September, 1850, with an earnest request, on public grounds, for early consideration, and an alternative appeal to the Court of Directors; not replied to at all before fresh statements forced on the trial and conviction of Nursoo; nor sent to the Court of Directors before February, 1852—a delay of seventeen months.

3. Nafra's attempt to bribe Soorujram was reported 10th July, 1850, and was never replied to. It was reported to the Court seventeen months afterwards, that is, a week after "the removal."

4. The case of Mr. Andrews was replied to subsequently to his death, after eleven months' delay, that is, five days before "the removal," and was sent to the Court at the same time.

5. The case of Joitabaee was replied to after eight months' delay, and was sent to the Court at the same time, that is, a week after "the removal."

These are only instances which might be easily extended, both as to the withholding of supporting decisions from the Resident, and the long-delayed transmission of cases to the Court, in which Colonel Outram had expressly appealed to that authority. It has already been shown that the mere inaction of the Government (suspected, as it was, by the people, of Khutputa tendencies) was quite enough always to discourage and often to defeat justice. It might amply excuse any outburst of "honest ardour," even in the unwilling form of constructive disrespect.

which had been ventured on through reliance on the oft-tried support of that corruption. Surely the utmost ingenuity of official complaisance might be held excused in failing to deal acceptably with such a theme; much more, may he be held blameless who has to speak of it from the midst of its harrowing results.

We need not here pursue the remark that the capability of quiet and calculating thought, however precious for its foresight and its grasp, is but one of the twin qualifications for great services, of which the other is the ardent, outbursting energy of moral principles; and that he who in such services tames down all his agents to the chilling accuracy of the one, fails just as surely as he who precipitates on unconsidered obstacles the fiery undisciplined strength of the other. Colonel Outram's defence, however, does not need the aid of this principle; for be it observed, there is no disrespectful passage actually adduced from any paper dated previously to his removal, except his statement, that he was at one time so discouraged by the want of support from the Bombay Government, as to have wished and endeavoured to place himself under the orders of the supreme Government of India, a wish afterwards abandoned. The charge of disrespect is mainly made out in this way: Colonel Outram states facts and advances arguments which, if true, lead to the inference that this Government is unworthy of respect; he says he believes them to be true; therefore he has, in fact, no respect for the Government although he does not say so in words. This summary statement of the question would of itself be defence enough against the charge of disrespect.

Let it be admitted however that, in the "honest ardour" with which Lord Falkland himself says Colonel Outram prosecuted his anti-Khutput efforts, he had failed of the conventional respect which highly-organised administrative bodies require from subordinates to superiors, and that in consequence it had really become necessary to displace him from his post,—even then the question is changed by but one remove. It is then to be asked, in a court far higher than that

formed of the official circle in which the debate originated, who occasioned that necessity? The subordinate may be sacrificed to an artificial exigency of office; and yet the superiors may suffer the vastly heavier condemnation of having both failed in their own proper duty, and of having so failed in it as to destroy the utility of their worthier agent besides. It would not close the question to show that Colonel Outram had been guilty of disrespect; it would only carry the whole case to a new and more searching investigation in the light of public opinion; and the withering sentence awarded, if found guilty on such a trial, is not the less surely executed because no constituted voice proclaims it. The materials for such a trial are before the reader.

If we now attempt to account for the removal of Colonel Outram, by considerations more accurate and sufficient than those supplied by these official papers, it is not with a view to charge the members of the Government of Bombay with insincerity. The best observers of their own feelings can rarely tell with perfect exactness, on any given occasion, from what motives they act; and, in an exciting crisis, the real causes of the movement are commonly hid by the dust and turmoil from the chief actors themselves.

Let us briefly recapitulate the events of a few months, and those principally of the last few weeks.

Official Reports had been coming in from nearly all other parts of the Presidency, affirming the general prevalence of this belief in their corruptibility. Mr. Andrews had just died, suffering from, if not killed by, the anxiety following on the finding of Nafra's memorandum. Nursoo, their long cherished favourite, had just been convicted; the cruel wrongs of Joitabaee, whom they had long despised, had been exposed; Nafra, whom they had latterly regarded with little or no disfavour, had been shown to be a monster, and was in reluctant chains; Nafra's enormous plunder of the bank had just been officially reported; Furkey, whom they hated, had just been shown to have been maligned and injured for years together; the rank untrustworthiness

of their own Secretariate had just been established; the minister of the Gaekwar had been shown to be deeply involved in corrupt conspiracies; every new fact was a new proof of their own errors; the frightful consequences of their errors were brought to light by every Report; the Court of Directors adopted, in general, the views established in those Reports, as far as they had yet been submitted to that authority; to form the climax, Colonel Outram brought home distinct evidence of arrangements for systematic corruption, so extensive and so long sustained, that assuredly nothing but past experience of success would be alleged by the public voice to have kept them up. He sent them a Report, in which the history, encouragements, and apparent success of corruption were laboriously traced, and its consequences charged on the mistakes of Government itself, through inferences which could only be parried by resentment on mere official and conventional grounds; he transmitted to them revelations which, however vaguely supported, were sufficient to affect reputations very near to their own; and he told them that much more (how much or what they did not know) was already within his grasp, waiting only their own authority to receive it.

Here then was a crisis; the whole fabric of their beliefs and prepossessions had broken down: a great and undefined danger still further threatened their own credit, and, possibly, the course of the policy committed to them. Nothing could stop the torrent of disclosures, true or false, surmised or substantiated as they might be, but the removal of the officer who, although ever within the line of his duty, would not let the subject rest; and Colonel Outram was accordingly removed.

The minutes of the different members of the Government bear marks of the state of feeling at the time. Colonel Outram's course is attributed to personal dislike of the Gaekwar's minister; then to the "instigation of Baba Furkey and other wily intriguers;" and then, when Furkey's clear acquittal permitted that phrase no

1282. 1285.

1312. longer, to resentment at the treatment he received from Government in the cases of the Gorajee Pol and of Govind Row Gaekwar. The "honest ardour" attributed to him by the Governor is a "monomania" and a "Quixotic design" in the mouth of Mr. Blane. Surely these shifting accusations are much more consistent with the flurried state of mind supposed, than with the calm consideration of the case, and the clear view of its relations which befitted a Government displacing one of its most important agents.

The effect of this "removal" on the professional and official standing of the distinguished officer who was the subject of it, is too obvious to need remark here; nor is this the place to descant on the loss to him, *for only doing his duty*, of the dignity and emoluments of a station conferred on him as the reward and attestation of a life of most remarkable public service. It is, moreover, a wrong done him, which no public judgment can redress, that efforts sincerely intended to vindicate the official purity of his fellow countrymen ruling India should have been so met as to convert friendships into enmities, and to embitter life with unsought and most repugnant disagreements. The true estimate of his proceedings at Baroda will, however, easily be formed by disinterested judges; and whoever may review hereafter the course of the British power in India will have to point to this struggle as one of those by which that rule was purified and so confirmed, or its downfall accelerated and foreshadowed.

The person to complain of permanent and irremediable injury is Mr. Reid, however little the pamphlet issued by that gentleman while these sheets were at press may exhibit any present sense of the true magnitude or nature of the infliction. His name is associated in one way or another, with several cases of Khutput both of earlier and later date, which are given in Colonel Outram's Report, and in these pages; unfortunately, also, the positive interference of Government stopped on two different occasions the examination of two different agents, Joteshwar and Govind Row Roria,

through whom alleged communications with Mr. Reid had been carried on. The first of these was a direction not to examine papers fairly in Colonel Outram's power, and, consequently, a removal of the only inducement to the confession, which was righteously exacted of their owner; the second was a refusal to give a needful assurance of protection on telling the truth. Now although they who know Mr. Reid will reject the inferences to be drawn from these facts with a decision and confidence proportioned to his established character, yet the future Mill of our Indian history, as well as the bulk of our contemporaries, cannot possess this advantage in forming their judgment on the case. Many a man has been "damned to everlasting fame" on evidence less plausibly conclusive than this. The injury to Mr. Reid is, that this process of investigation, cut short just where it was of vital importance to himself, can never again be resumed, with any probability of arriving at the truth.

Still more important, however, is it to estimate the effect of the removal on the native mind. It has been shown in these pages that every native official charged with corrupt practices had all advantages of tardy and precise accusation, of legal defence, of a careful if not partial review of the evidence against him, and, in case of conviction after all, he had the further advantage of the most lenient sentence which circumstances would permit. On the other hand, the persistent denunciator of corruption, after seeing every one of his native assistants shamefully persecuted, was dismissed on charges neither precise, nor carefully considered, nor supported by evidence, nor after defence called for, nor even sufficient, under the circumstances, to warrant the measure, had they been true; but merely on a loose and mistaken allegation of that want of concurrence in the feelings and purposes of Government, which, on the supposition Government were honest, he had repeatedly urged in vain as a sufficient reason for the discharge of dishonest political servants. Let it be remembered that all this was as well known

in its detail in the offices of the native Government at Baroda as in those of ours at Bombay, and that it fell on minds already possessed with a full belief in the efficacy of Khutput; we may then judge what were the opinions which had been formed before Colonel Outram turned his back on the scene of his ungrateful labours.

Colonel Outram was dismissed ostensibly in consequence of the letter accompanying his Khutput Report; the Report itself was reserved for future consideration.

1509. On the 29th of April the Governor recorded a minute, in which, after describing the different sections of the document, he remarks that its general tenor is a series of charges against all Governments of Bombay for twenty years past; that he attributes, in no slight degree, the general belief in the efficacy of Khutput to the acts of the Government itself; that he, the Governor, does not agree in that conclusion; that everything has been reported as it occurred to the Court of Directors *, by whom the Government of Bombay is content to be judged; that as Colonel Outram has not impugned the integrity or honour of the present or any former Government, the whole is resolved into differences of opinion between the Government and its local officers, in which the Government, as it had a right to do, took its own course; that such differences did not justify Colonel Outram in attacking the Government; and that his having so attacked it without justification was a proof of his unfitness for his post; that the guarantees given by us to subjects of the Gaekwar ought not to be so interpreted as to infringe on that prince's just authority as secured by treaty; that the guarantees have nothing to do with transactions between parties in the Baroda State, but only protect certain Gaekwar subjects against oppression by the prince †; that he, the Governor, had

* See, however, note, page 137.

† This is hardly consistent with their urging Colonel Outram to report on Joitabaee's case in its early stages, or with their participation in the appointment of a manager for Hurree Bhugtee's Bank, and the taking of securities from him.

given assurances to the Gaekwar's agent, of suitable apologies for the misconduct of Mr. Andrews' native officer; that he, the Governor, viewed the "disparaging insinuations" against Mr. Reid, with "the utmost dissatisfaction," and that the best way of vindicating Mr. Reid's character might well be left with the Court.

1512. Mr. Warden, a temporary member of Council, who had just joined it, deferred his intended remarks "on the great impediment to good government which this Khutput presents," and hints that Colonel Outram had apparently drawn the distinction between the natives' belief respecting Mr. Reid and his own.

1513. The Governor, Mr. Blane, and Mr. Bell, then express their pleasure that Mr. Warden is to give them his thoughts on Khutput; say that Khutput, in one form or another, prevails everywhere, both east and west; and refuse to admit that Colonel Outram does not suspect, along with the natives, the corruptibility of Mr. Reid.

It will be observed that, in these papers, the Government evade the real questions, viz. whether the acts of the Government, for a series of years (justifiable on other grounds or not), had been of a character to impress the natives with the belief in the corruptibility of the Government? And whether Colonel Outram was justified in laying before Government the proofs he had accumulated through years of official life, that such had been the effect of their acts? The separate and entirely subordinate question, whether he had performed that duty in a manner respectful towards themselves, they settle in these last papers, as in all their preceding ones, chiefly by assumption, without once considering whether his failure, if he had failed, was not under the circumstances quite venial, or whether the vast weight of the subject-matters of discussion ought not to have led them to postpone, till they were settled, all questions which could possibly be deemed personal to themselves.

It is to be remarked that Mr. Willoughby, who was

in Council during the first part of the time, Sir John Grey, the Commander-in-Chief, and Mr. Warden, who came in late, avoid committing themselves to the opinions or acts of their colleagues. These bye-standers probably saw the game more truly than those who were involved in the excitement of playing it*.

21. In this state the closely-connected questions of Khutput and of Colonel Outram's removal were (29th November, 1851), sent to the
26. Court of Directors. The Court, answered 26th June, 1852†, that they had not yet received the "Khutput Report," except from Colonel Outram himself; that they would consider it when it was officially transmitted; that Colonel Outram had misconceived the extent of his powers; that he had failed to express himself respectfully to the Government; that the Court regret an early opportunity was not taken of calling his attention to this failure, and of requiring its correction; that the Court gives him "credit for the zeal, energy, ability, and success, with which he prosecuted inquiries attended with great difficulty; and, taking this view of the case, express their hope that when Lieutenant-Colonel Outram shall return to India," the Government of Bombay "will find a suitable opportunity of employing him where his talents and experience may prove useful to the public service."

Here, as far as is publicly known, the question now stands. It is understood that the Reports of all the

* It is but due to Mr. Willoughby to note, that on its being communicated to him early in 1838, that in Guzerat, where he had long resided, many people attributed the success of Khutput, in Bombay, to him, he avoided all participation in the affairs of that quarter, and only signed, for conformity of office, the papers prepared by others. His minutes, so long as he remained in Council, exhibit an evident desire to support Colonel Outram's investigations, and to promote the interests of justice, however they may occasionally dissent from Colonel Outram's mode of effecting those objects.

Mr. Malet, too, it should be remembered, is not always to be judged by the official papers in the Blue Books, which he had to sign in a merely ministerial capacity.

† See the annexed "Dissent" of Colonel Sykes.

officers to whom the Khutput circular was addressed, except one or two, affirmed the existence, in each district, of the same belief which Colonel Outram had so laboriously investigated at Baroda. Whether this belief be merely a continuation of that which prevailed all over India under its native sovereigns, or whether it be really kept up by secret occasional acts of corruption on the part of any of those entrusted with the high offices of our Indian administration, no duty can be plainer or more imperative than that of showing, by effective deeds, that the British rule is truly and essentially incorruptible. So long, however, as a Khutputist can point to the unredressed removal of Colonel Outram, and the unrebuked mistakes of the Bombay Government, words and regulations, be they as emphatic or as stringent as they may, will be all in vain; they will only be taken for a new screen to cherished, though shameful, abuse.

The materials for this extraordinary story have been derived almost exclusively from one single official source, viz. the bulky and misarranged volumes familiarly known as "The Khutput Blue Books." But what will the reader think when he is told, on uncontradicted authority*, that Tambeykur, the Gaekwar's minister, not, however, minister by our official recognition, which treaty requires,—Tambeykur, proved to be the corrupter of our own native civil officers; proved to be the soul of intrigues for bribing our highest representatives; known to have been, and still to be, in league with a man branded by our own Government for corruption, and now suffering an ignominious punishment for atrocious crimes,—that this Tambeykur, who is credibly charged with being a traitor to his own prince,—that this Tambeykur, for opposition to whom Colonel Outram was removed in what was meant to be disgrace,—that this Tambeykur has been received by the present British representative at Baroda with honours given only to reigning princes? Is it

* The "Bombay Overland Telegraph and Courier," of 17th December, 1852.

any wonder that the Gaekwar, sunk in the sensuality which seems to have become his refuge from inglorious inaction and galling thraldom, immediately ordered that the same royal honours should be paid to his minister at his own court, on witnessing this new and splendid demonstration to him, of the irresistible power of Tambeykur's "Khutput in Bombay?"

POSTSCRIPT.

REPLY TO MR. REID.

Mr. Reid's "Letter to the Editor of the *Daily News*," in answer to the strictures of "Indus," was published while the foregoing sheets were at press. I sit down with extreme reluctance to the task that publication imposes on me. For Mr. Reid I have entertained great respect from September, 1845, the date of my arrival in Bombay on the preliminary investigations of the Great Indian Peninsular Railway Company which I had commenced in England. He was then in Council. His constant and earnest advocacy of public improvements, and the reliance I found I might always place on his best efforts to promote my public objects, afforded me reasons for entertaining sentiments towards him which such intercourse as circumstances have required since his return to England has not diminished.

In the reduction of the contents of the bulky and most disorderly Blue Books to some generally useful dimensions and form, I determined to admit nothing of a personal nature which was not in the Blue Books themselves. Mr. Reid accordingly appears in these pages with no greater prominence than in the original documents, and I should have been much better pleased if fidelity would have permitted me to sink his name altogether in more general designations. I may add that Col. Outram, for the part he has had in the preparation of this narrative,—that of more occasional correction of misapprehensions,—has fully shared my views in respect of the treatment of individual names, and of Mr. Reid's amongst them.

How far Mr. Reid may have felt that his own defence necessarily required an attack on Col. Outram, it is not possible for me to judge. His pamphlet, however, does in fact contain representations at variance with those I have given

from the Blue Books, and it is chiefly by means of these differing representations that his strictures on Col. Outram are supported. Explanations are thus required of me, which I should gladly avoid but cannot. I shall endeavour to admit into them as little as possible which is not already public, but I shall not be able to keep this rule so completely as heretofore.

Mr. Reid nowhere denies the general belief of the natives in the venality of the Bombay Government, neither does he attempt to account for it, or to show how it may be corrected. He equally avoids defending the proceedings of that Government in respect of Col. Outram's removal. Nothing in his pamphlet goes to disturb materially the estimate to be formed of the main facts by which any general questions arising out of the case must be ultimately determined. According to him, no less than others, (page 24,) Baroda is "a vile sink of corruption," and the Secretariate of Bombay has long maintained a corrupt connection with Baroda.

The errors into which he has fallen, in so far as they affect his attack on Col. Outram, I will now try to show, quoting as far as possible his own words*.

The following extract from page 9, refers to the Nagur cases:

1341. Nar. 10, &c. —"During two of the four years," (1835-1838,) "of their progress, I was absent at the Cape of "Good Hope. Even when in Bombay, I was "neither a member of the Government, nor Secretary of the "department in which they were considered. I never was "consulted in respect to them; nor, had I been so, could I "have given advice, for I was ignorant of every particular "connected with them, and am so to this day, except so far as "I have very recently heard them spoken of, and seen them "alluded to in the cursory view which I have taken of those "parts of the Blue Book in which my name is not specifically "mentioned."

The facts are these:—On 29th June, 1837, Col. Outram first reported his suspicions of Brijlal and Dowlutram, both subsequently convicted. On 29th September following, Mr. Secretary Wathen communicated the orders of Government for their trial in a mode opposed to the judgment of the local officers. On the 27th November Mr. Reid returned to Bombay from the Cape, and resumed his former office of Secretary. In January following Mr. Willoughby was

1342-5. 1343-10. R. 6. Nar. 12.

* The references to the preceding pages of this pamphlet are distinguished by the letters "Nar." Those from Mr. Reid's pamphlet by "R.;" those from the Blue Book will be easily understood.

apprised, by a letter from Col. Outram, that the people in Guzerat attributed the favour shown these Nagur delinquents to their corrupt influence with him; whereupon he obtained permission from Sir Robert Grant to stand aloof from the cases which related to Guzerat, which cases, I am informed, rested thereafter with Mr. Reid, or his department. It was while they so rested that these delinquents escaped twice on contradictory pretences;—first, because the investigation to which their conduct had already been subjected was not a trial but an inquiry, and then because it was not an inquiry but a trial. Mr. Reid says that ordinarily the Secretary drafts the minutes of the Governor. Did he himself do so in these cases? or had some Khutput-fed subordinate the opportunity of doing it?

1343–12. Nar. 14. R. 5.

Mr. Reid says, at page 8; that Col. Outram does not understand Mahrattee or Guzerattee, the languages of the court and people of Baroda respectively. What then? Col. (then Captain) Outram, no professed linguist, was selected, without his own solicitation, to tranquillise the wild districts in the north of Guzerat, then much disorganized and disturbed. He so succeeded that his work has remained unshaken to this day. Since that time all the world has seen his course—a course of political employment which always *sought him*. He was selected for the Baroda Residency with a full knowledge of his qualifications. There have been linguists whose acquirements have been useless for want of the higher requisites to their useful employment: there have been British rulers in India whose eminent qualifications have forced themselves into play, and into vast public utility, in spite of the great disadvantage of not having language at ready command. In any case, when a man has already done his work well, it is too late to find fault with his tools.

Page 14.—"But what should be especially remarked is "this:—of all the sweeping assertions of rumours to my "prejudice in Baroda, not one was noticed to the Government "while I was in India; not one was known to me until, after "the publication of the 'Chapters,' I read them lately in the "Blue Book."

Mr. Reid returned to office as Secretary in November, 1837. He remained in Bombay as Secretary, Member of Council, and Acting Governor until 3rd March, 1849. Now, in 1838, Mr. Malet, and Col. Outram, as well as others, forcibly told the Government of the estimation as to venality in which the natives held them. The last-mentioned officer went twice to

R. 6. Nar. 12, &c. 1348.

Bombay to urge the Government to take measures for eradicating this belief. During all this time Mr. Reid was the Secretary with whom the business rested. It is true these were, for the most part, popular accusations against the Government corporately, not as distinguished into individuals.

951–J. 1023–46. Nar. 34.

But Nursoo's boast of Mr. Reid's favour was stated to Government in November, 1848, four months before he left India; and if the charge was conveyed in a pseudonymous petition, such as Mr. Reid contemns, it must be remembered that these very Blue Books show that such petitions often contain truth; in India, indeed, it is often the only form in which truth can at first appear. Mr. Reid left intimate friends in high office in Bombay when he came to England. In June or July, 1851, Col. Outram forwarded to Mr. Reid's intimate connections in England his "Statement of Facts" respecting Nursoo, and parts of all such papers as contained anything relating to Mr. Reid himself. Finally, Mr. Reid has friends amongst the Directors, through whom it would be strange if he was not informed of the reports sent home in 1852. Mr. Reid himself says (page 65) that Col. Outram told him, on his return to England in the summer of last year, that "he ought to be most thankful to him for bringing to justice the scoundrels who had made so infamous a use of his name."

Page 20.—The next extract relates to the anonymous letters to Mr. Reid and Mr. Willoughby, stating it would be to their advantage to favour Hurree Bhugtee's Bank in a dispute then before the Government.

"There was, as stated by the Chief Secretary, no clue whatever to trace their origin. To Col. Outram, however, nothing was impossible. He at once 'had no doubt from whom it came,'—that is, the letter sent to my house; and he probably had no greater doubt in respect to that sent to Mr. Willoughby; although my name is here, as elsewhere, for obvious reasons, prominently brought to notice. He decides peremptorily that Baba Nafra had 'caused it to be written,' and treats this throughout as an indisputable fact. Now, even on this point, it is just as likely that he may be in error, as that he may be right."

The letter to Mr. Willoughby was dated 10th April, 1848, and was brought to his house by Baba Nafra's Gomashta, with a present of fruit, which is customary on occasion of natives from the country calling on high functionaries in Bombay. The fact was stated by Mr. Willoughby to Colonel

Outram as exhibiting Nafra's impudence. Mr. Willoughby circulated this note on the 17th July, 1850, as Mr. Reid states; but Mr. Reid does not go on to say, as the fact is, that Mr. Willoughby circulated it on occasion of a proposed inquiry into Nafra's corruptions, with which this anonymous note could have had no connection but through Mr. Willoughby's belief as to its origin.

1082. 1217. Nar. 45.

Pages 21 and 22.—Colonel Outram's letters of 31st August and 7th Sept., 1848, "contain no allusion to the fact, since "so prominently adduced, of Nursoo Punt's family connection "with Baba Nafra, the managing partner of Huree Bhugtee's "firm, and others at Baroda; of which, indeed, he tells us he "was not cognizant till about the middle of October, 1850. It "is somewhat strange that though Colonel Outram was Resi- "dent from May, 1847, he had not, till nearly three and a "half years subsequently, ascertained that there was any con- "nection between his native agent and any parties at Baroda, "although a former Resident in reporting to Government on "the anonymous petition of March, 1844 (to which so much "importance has been since attached), had stated the par- "ticulars of such connection."

Be it so;—then clearly Colonel Outram's strongly-expressed convictions of Nursoo's complicity with Nafra were not a mere prejudice founded on their connection, which he did not then know. Be it so;—but Government were informed of it (those particular members of the Government most likely to be impressed with a recollection of the fact, and Mr. Reid amongst them), who might therefore have been expected to regard Colonel Outram's early suspicions of Nursoo as better founded than he himself had supposed. Be it so;—but then, of the three years and a half which elapsed before he came to a knowledge of the fact, one and a half was occupied by his first stay at Baroda before he went to Egypt, and it was only in the latter part of that time, July, 1848, that Nursoo's conduct had given so much consistence to the suspicions he had begun to entertain some time before, as to lead him to anticipate anything more against him than what openly appeared. During the next period of more than a year and a half, Colonel Outram was absent from Baroda; it was the month of October following his return in May, 1850, that Colonel Outram first learned the extent and character of Nursoo's family connections, that native officer being in the meantime not at Baroda but at Ahmedabad, and Colonel Outram having therefore no further interest in him than

to exhibit his misdoings for the sake of future reforms. Be it so;—what, then, must be the condition of an establishment in which the intimate connection of the first confidential servant of the Government with the notorious and convicted chief and agent of a body of corruptionists long leagued together, could be concealed even for a month from the responsible European chief? and why was the constant favour of Government shown, as we have seen, to the members of such an establishment in opposition to the declared distrust of its head?

Page 22.—"When, on the 9th Sept., 1848, Colonel Outram "forwarded Nursoo Punt's application for permission to "retire, and, in consideration of his eminent services, for "some pension beyond what the ordinary rules awarded to "him, he did so with his 'recommendation.' Not a word was "then said of suspicion—not a word of warning to the Go-"vernment not to decide on the request for extra pension "till the case of Pol had been disposed of. It is clear that "at that time Colonel Outram had no very strong opinion "of Nursoo Punt's guilt. He brought against him no dis-"tinct charge of criminality, and admits that all he desired "was to get rid of him from his office, and this no doubt "was all that his *protégé*, Furké, cared for also."

Literally, something of this is true; substantially, the facts are as follows:—

156. 1848, *July*.—Colonel Outram, distrusting Nursoo, sought the aid of Furkey in the Govind Row Gaekwar and Gorajee Pol cases.

981-D. 1407-*. Nar. 41. 31*st August*.—Colonel Outram took a deposition of Nursoo as to his conduct in one of those cases.

984-26. 1405-30. 31*st August*. 7*th Sept*. } Colonel Outram forwarded these cases to Government, and in both the letters he charged Nursoo with misconduct, as Mr. Reid himself says at page 21; and he did this so plainly and seriously that Government thought it necessary, in the following January, to enter on his full defence, Mr. Reid himself (page 29) writing the minute, afterwards adopted by the Governor, on which the exonerating despatch was founded.

9th September.—Colonel Outram forwarded Nursoo's application for his retiring pension, and Mr. Reid is literally correct in saying that *in this particular paper* the Resident did not accuse Nursoo, or caution the Government, having done so only two days before.

12th September.—Colonel Outram left Baroda for Bombay.

958-20. Nar. 41. *18th September.*—Nursoo petitioned Government to be heard against Colonel Outram's charges.

962. Nar. 60. 1849, *12th January.*—Government replied to Colonel Outram's charges against Nursoo, as stated above.

And yet Mr. Reid says, "not a word was then said of suspicion," he himself having said only in the previous page that Colonel Outram had "noticed what he deemed his discreditable conduct," viz., "culpable collusion" or "gross neglect." The "pension beyond what the ordinary rules awarded to him" was his claim on Warden's Official Fund, to which Colonel Outram had nothing to say. The "recommendation" was an ordinary matter of routine, seeing that not so much had then come to the knowledge of the Resident against this old and famous servant as prevented him from suggesting that Nursoo should have the benefit of any doubt the Government might entertain; nor indeed had Nursoo yet committed some of the chief offences which afterwards so ruined his long-established reputation.

Mr. Reid here and elsewhere alleges that Colonel Outram's object was to displace Nursoo as Native Agent, in favour of Furkey. Let this be admitted, although so put as to be somewhat beyond the truth. What then? The Resident's confidence, cordially given him at first, Nursoo had lost, through signs of his complicity with the Khutputists; Furkey had earned the hatred of those very Khutputists by his former success in exposing them. To retain Nursoo, as was afterwards proved, was to give these men access to all records, and the means of employing any kind of foul influence;—to employ Furkey was to place in this highly confidential post the man the least likely, from old animosities, to be won over to unfaithfulness. Colonel Outram's early estimate of Nursoo was shown afterwards to be correct. Furkey, at a later period, became so deeply involved in differences with the Gaekwar's officers, originating in the aid he had given to what should have been the cause of our Government, that Colonel Outram found it necessary to refuse his countenance to his being employed in Guzerat by either Government, and desired to obtain employment for him in his native country, the Deccan. I have not been able to find a sufficient reason for Furkey having so many enemies in official circles in Bombay. At first I supposed that his good qualities might be marred by disagreeable peculiarities of

manner, or some objectionable speciality of connection, private conduct, or circumstance; but I can hear of nothing of that kind, and the matter is left at present to rest on the disgraceful inference that he is hated in Bombay, as in Baroda, for having so well aided Mr. Malet and Colonel Outram in bringing some of the Nagurs to justice. Nor, since it has been so often thought worth while by his enemies to attack him by accusations, proved by our own officers to be based on perjury and falsifications, can we fail to conclude, that if he had been guilty of any real offence the same parties would have been eager to bring it to light. After all this, the credit in England of the British officials in Bombay clearly requires that their position towards Furkey should be explained. I assume that explanation is quite possible.

Page 25.—"I now learn from the Blue Book, that in March, "1844, a petition had been sent to Government against Nur-"soo Punt, which proved to be fictitious;—to such, I am sorry "to perceive that Colonel Outram has an extraordinary par-"tiality. I cannot say I did not see this petition, for I entered "Council in that month; but it certainly made no impres-"sion on my memory, and I may conscientiously use, in "reference to my knowledge of him in 1848, the words of "Colonel Outram, 'I never heard a word whispered to his "disadvantage.'"

The minute on this petition, and the signatures to it, are as follows: it will be remembered that "D. Dadajee" was the chief agent of the great intrigues of the immediately preceding years, and of the "persons" Nafra is chiefly meant.

946-7. Nar. 39. "*Minute by the Honourable the Governor, concurred in by the Board.*

"I observe that Nursoo Punt is connected with persons who were implicated in the case of D. Dadajee.

"It is to be regretted that Mr. Boyd did not ascertain and report this when he recommended him to be his native agent.

"Considering, however, the high character and respectability of Nursoo Punt, I do not think his connections with those persons should be held to be a disqualification for the situation, though Mr. Boyd must take care that the orders already issued for their exclusion from the Residency are strictly attended to.

"The above observations should be communicated to the Political Commissioner for Guzerat.

(Signed) "*G. Arthur.*
"*J. H. Crawford.*
"*L. R. REID.*"

"*24th May*, 1844."

Page 26:—The following refers to the letters of Colonel Outram, of the 31st August and 7th September, which charged Nursoo with misconduct, as said above:—

"Seeing so deliberate a charge of delay in answering these "letters brought against me, and being unable from the Blue "Book to ascertain the real facts of the case, I was disposed "at first to think that there might be some grounds for the "imputation, and,—while most distinctly and unreservedly "declaring that such delay, whatever it might have been, was "no more than was usual in hundreds of instances, where "matters requiring special consideration were allowed to lie "over until time could be found, under the pressure of other "business, to write upon them,—to disclaim all notice or design "in not bringing the matter at once to a conclusion, so far "as I was concerned, especially as there was nothing ap-"parent on the face of Colonel Outram's letters calling for "extreme or unusual haste.'"

This quotation compels me to go more fully than before into these cases; a wearisomeness of repetition for which I can only plead necessity.

The following are the facts, in order of date, with the authorities for them. The years are 1848 and 1849:—

1405-31. 984. Nar. 40. *7th September.*—Colonel Outram handed up these cases; drew further attention to Nursoo's misconduct, and asked for lenient consideration for him.

1390-47. *12th September.*—Colonel Outram left Baroda, in ill-health, to go to Egypt by way of Bombay.

1405-32. *17th September.*—Colonel Outram arrived in Bombay, and pressingly offered any personal explanations which his Reports on these cases might be deemed to require.

959-20. *18th September.*—Nursoo petitioned to be heard against Colonel Outram's representations; his petition was transmitted *privately*, and kept a secret from Colonel Outram, then and long afterwards.

1244-11. *26th September.*—Nursoo's irregular petition was circulated to the members of Government.

1245-13. *7th October.*—The Governor recorded a minute in which Nursoo is *exculpated from Colonel Outram's charges*, and is desired to retract his application for a retiring pension.

1391-49. 1405-35. *3rd November.*—Colonel Outram sailed for Egypt, having stayed in Bombay seven weeks; having repeatedly pressed for decision in these

cases, he offered not only any further information deemed requisite, but to postpone his departure, if requisite to a sufficient explanation. He was always *told* the papers were in Mr. Reid's hands, which Mr. Reid himself now renders probable, by saying, page 30, that he wrote one (if no more) of the Governor's minutes on these questions. Nursoo's petition was still kept secret from Colonel Outram.

951-J. 1014-24. *20th November.* } Government receive a peti-
25th November. } tion which informs them of Nursoo's high boastings of Mr. Reid's corrupt favour, of which boastings Nursoo is afterwards convicted.

1082-6. *15th December.*—The orders of Government issued on these cases, in which Nursoo was implicated, on minutes dated from the 20th November onwards.

1046-4. *21st December.*—The petition of 25th November, against Nursoo, circulated to the members of Government.

1061-34. *3rd January.*—The date of the "Maurrice Letter," which gave Nursoo exact information of the intentions of Government in his favour.

1245-14. *4th January.*—The Governor's minute of 7th October, *exonerating Nursoo*, and desiring him to retract his application for his retiring pension, concurred in

1083-9. by the Board, and dispatched to Baroda. *On the same day*, Government sent to the Acting Resident, Captain French, for report, the petition of the 25th November, which apprised them of Nursoo's scandalous use of Mr. Reid's name; the Acting Resident returned for answer, after one day's inquiry, that no such man as the petitioner could be found.

962. *12th January.*—The Government wrote a letter, the production of Mr. Reid (page 30), defending Nursoo's conduct in these cases, in matters of which he was subsequently convicted, and censuring Colonel Outram for distrusting him.

1245-14. *13th January.*—Captain French reported that Nursoo did not then wish to retire; on which Government was pleased to permit him to remain.

The interdict against Nafra's entering the Residency was removed soon after, and in three months Joitabaee's petitions were returned unread.

Nursoo, then, was acquitted, praised, and confirmed in his post without reference to his superior, who had complained of him, and who for seven weeks was standing ready to substantiate his complaints. And although Colonel Outram's departure in search of health depended on the decision, and

was known to do so, Mr. Reid thinks himself at liberty to state only that there was "nothing apparent *on the face of Colonel Outram's letters* calling for extreme haste." All this time Mr. Reid was "on terms of intimacy" with Colonel Outram*.

The petition of Nursoo was forwarded to Government in a manner so irregular, that had it come from any other person it would have been returned without notice. Now the pseudonymous petition of Jezram Hybutrow, of 25th November, noticed above, which was afterwards found under judicial inquiry to have stated the truth substantially in all other respects, says expressly that Nursoo declared, "I have the support of Mr. Reid, the councillor. '*I have sent him a petition*, together with a memorandum of kulumbundee (instructions or particulars)." I believe Mr. Reid will not deny that this irregular petition was sent to him, and that, irregular as it was, he himself put it in train.

Mr. Reid disapproves Colonel Outram's seeking investigation into these cases after he had officially reported on them, and calls his doing so a species of Khutput. Nursoo's secret

* In consequence of the statements of Mr. Reid, at page 32, Colonel Outram applied to the Court of Directors for access to the unpublished papers in the Govind Row Gaekwar case. His request was immediately granted, and he has thus been enabled to furnish me with the following extract from a letter of his own to the Chief Secretary, dated 30th July, 1850, which states the nature of his verbal communications to the Government at the time referred to. It will be observed that the Governor in his despatch, quoted page 160, agrees in the same representation; a matter, indeed, of which no doubt has been expressed, except by Mr. Reid. The extract is as follows:—"I cannot but express my deep regret, "that so heavy a charge as that of fraud having been brought against a "firm enjoying the favour and protection of the British Government, *I* "*was not called on* to amend my Report, and supply such explanations as "might have been found necessary to the thorough understanding of the "case. For this there was ample time. I remained in Bombay nearly "two months after dispatching that report, prior to my departure to "Egypt; during the whole of which period I was a frequent visitor at "your office, and I was in constant communication with the members of "Government" (of whom Mr. Reid was one). "And as you, Sir, must well "remember, *I repeatedly declared that if there were the slightest doubts on* "*the part of Government as to the commission of the alleged frauds*, OR AS "REGARDED THE MISCONDUCT OF THE NATIVE AGENT (Nursoo) in reference "to them, or the Gorajee Pol case, which formed the subject of my "Report dated 7th September, 1848, I was ready to clear them up, to ex- "plain what was obscure, and supply what was deficient; nay, so anxious "was I that truth should be reached, that I was ready *to delay my departure* "*to Egypt, were such a step requisite for the due investigation of the case.* "Such having been the case, and *no explanations having been demanded* "*of me*, I was certainly astonished to find, on my return to India, that a "transaction had been passed over in silence, which was to my mind "grossly and transparently fraudulent," &c. &c.

petition, however, was at least as far from rule, even on Mr. Reid's principle, as Colonel Outram's offer of further aid in the discussion,—with this difference, however, that Colonel Outram's representations were open and distinct, and not of such a nature as to preclude any reference to Nursoo which justice might require. Nursoo's petition was converted into Khutput by being *kept secret*, with an effect we soon shall see*.

The pseudonymous petition was received, says the title to the translation, on the 25th November; Mr. Frere, in his judicial Report, says, on 20th November; probably his suppressed paper would show where it was during the interval. On the former date, it was passed to the department of translation, and was kept there nearly a month, that is, until after the cases in which Nursoo had been charged with misconduct by Colonel Outram had been disposed of. 1014-24.

But more than all this, the Governor *exonerated* Nursoo by a minute dated 7th October; while the Governor's earliest minute on the Govind Row Gaekwar and Gorajee Pol cases, in which Nursoo's conduct was questioned by Colonel Outram, is dated 20th November, six weeks afterwards. Mr. Reid himself says, page 31, "It is impossible to suppose the Governor could have written this, or that his Council would have concurred in it (it does indeed appear *when* they concurred), had they not all had under their consideration the whole of the papers connected with the charge of misconduct brought against Nursoo Punt, in the two cases submitted by Colonel Outram. This, be it observed, was about a month *before* Colonel Outram left for Egypt."

Now on the 15th November, 1850, that is, a year afterwards, Lord Falkland says, of these very matters, "I may state that Colonel Outram's letter being in circulation at the time he was in Bombay, no advantage could be taken of the offer made by him to the chief secretary, as noticed in his letter, *as the decision of Government as to the guilt or innocence of Nursoo could not be anticipated;* indeed I have, in my minute of the 28th December, stated, in paragraph 12, that my opinion was *at first* UNFAVOURABLE *to the native functionary*, so that at the period to 985-4.

* There is here involved a principle of great importance in practical administration. When the responsible head of an executive department declares his entire mistrust of a subordinate, it is clear that if the superior authorities maintain the subordinate in his post, they relieve the executive head of all responsibility for the results. The question is too large for discussion here; but at any rate Mr. Reid's support of Nursoo, after the declaration of Colonel Outram's opinion of him, must have rendered the Baroda Residency establishment wholly inefficient.

which Colonel Outram allúdes. *I could not have supposed any further communication from him on the subject necessary.*"*

That is, while the minutes and Mr. Reid show that Nursoo was exculpated in fact, although not in complete official form, on the 7th October, "*a month before Colonel Outram left for Egypt,*" Lord Falkland says, a year after, that he did not ask Colonel Outram's opinion while he was in Bombay, because the papers were in circulation, and the decision of the Government could not be anticipated; and moreover, although the minute of 7th October (afterwards concurred in on the 7th January following) shows that Nursoo was *already exonerated,* while Colonel Outram was yet in Bombay, Lord Falkland says he did not ask Colonel Outram's opinion, because it then seemed unnecessary, *his own opinion being then against Nursoo.*

In attempting an explanation of these singular contradictions, we must resort, in part, to Mr. Reid's own account at page 5, of the manner in which the Governor's minutes are usually prepared for him. It seems that "when a Governor himself possesses Indian or practical knowledge which enables him to propose measures without consulting any other party," he prepares the minutes himself; but when it is not so, or where the cases are not of extraordinary importance, "they are brought to him in draft for his consideration by the secretary of the department." Mr. Reid says, however, page 29, that in this case he wrote the minute himself, which afterwards became the Governor's, and was then made the foundation of the letter of the 12th January.

First, then, Mr. Reid receives and circulates an irregular petition from Nursoo, and a fortnight after he writes a minute wholly exculpating him of matters of which he was subsequently convicted on much the same evidence; and all this time, Colonel Outram, anxiously alive to the subject, and continually pressing it, was, by somebody or other, kept completely in the dark, and led to suppose the whole matter was delayed.

Although this conduct of Mr. Reid's is too much open to question, yet it exhibits nothing which might not have arisen from a sincere conviction in Nursoo's favour. But in looking at the conduct of the entire governing body of Bombay, we have to take all the events of the time together. The manœuvre, whether directed by principals, or managed by underlings in Nursoo's own fashion, of sly suppressions or postponements, seems to have been this.

* The *italics* are not in the original.

The Governor was first got to commit himself to an acquittal and approval of Nursoo on the 7th October, while Colonel Outram was yet in Bombay, waiting to discuss the case; then the minute in which this was done, together with the petition against Nursoo, was kept secret until after Colonel Outram's departure for Egypt, lest discussions should be raised, and the Colonel go back to Baroda to spoil the scheme; the Gorajee Pol and Govind Row Gaekwar cases seem to have been kept back in like manner for the same reason. As soon as he was gone these matters were all taken up, and Nursoo was refixed in his place, to what effect Joitabaee best can tell. A year afterwards, (Mr. Reid having left for England meanwhile,) when all was to be explained, and the unaccountable favour to Nursoo defended, Lord Falkland was induced to sign the minute, prepared probably by some subordinate, which contains the extraordinary contradictions to recorded facts which I have quoted above.

Whatever else is left in doubt here, two things are plain: Nursoo by private favours gained that consideration of his side of the case by the Government, which Colonel Outram could not gain for his by open solicitation and on public grounds; and, while the Bombay Government cannot keep their documents, or even their private resolves, from any who chooses to pay for a knowledge of them, they can contrive to keep them effectually from their own confidential officers who are directly concerned in them, but who will not pay. Nor is it less clear, that at this particular time, that of the riddance of Colonel Outram, of the accession of Captain French, and of fresh appearances of success in Nafra's enterprize against Joitabaee, there was extraordinary care in management at Bombay, and irrepressible elation at Baroda.

I go now to the mode in which the subject-matter of these cases was disposed of. Govind Row Gaekwar, a relative of the reigning Gaekwar, but possessed of the British guarantee, had a claim made on him by the Hurree Bhugtee bank, under Nafra's direction, for a large sum, of which as much as 30,000*l.* was for interest. To support this claim, an old and cancelled bond was produced, and the interest, at greatly erroneous rates, calculated on it. Nursoo supplied to the Resident a Report which countenanced the claim, and withheld from his knowledge documents showing its dishonesty: he said nothing to indicate either fraud or error. But Colonel Outram found reason for suspicion, and in the end clearly detected the attempt to mislead him; and then it was, that Nursoo made the suggestion for which Mr. Reid gives him credit at pages

984.
962
Nar. 40.

27 and 56, without saying a word of this suggestion having been made by him after his attempt to carry through Nafra's fraud had been frustrated. The sum eventually awarded for interest was about 6000*l.* instead of 30,000*l.*

Mr. Reid denies, page 45, that in this matter the Government solemnly ignored a charge of forgery well supported by proof. He says that Colonel Outram never made more of it than a charge of constructive forgery, against Nafra, and that although the Court of Directors in differing in opinion from the Government, directed further inquiries, yet they say, "that the case was not very clearly brought before them in Colonel Outram's letter." They go on, however, beyond Mr. Reid's quotation, to say in continuation of it, "But we should "have expected that, if his conclusion was not admitted, "the insufficiency of his reasons would have been shown, or "the subject referred to him for further explanations,"—the very explanations he had offered. There is, however, more in it than this. Colonel Outram was seven weeks in Bombay, waiting to explain, if needful, this very business, and there he was very carefully *not* listened to. Mr. Reid now takes advantage of the obscurity, if any, which he might then very easily have obviated in a case where the facts were afterwards proved strongly enough for conviction: and afterwards, when Colonel Outram forwarded a further account of the matter, that account *was withheld from the Court for sixteen months*, and the only notice of it which has yet appeared is, that its title is the first item of the list in page 24 of the Blue Books.

For the "constructive forgery," which Colonel Outram deemed this offence, he proposed the withdrawal of the guarantee from the firm; a measure quite in consonance both with the terms of the guarantee itself, and with the repeated instances of the Court of Directors to curtail these embarrassing engagements. It was afterwards well for Joitabaee that this advice was not acceded to by the Government. Mr. Reid says, that the proposal is proof that Colonel Outram "up to this date could not think Joitabaee the injured person he has since declared her to be." True; the facts which thoroughly convinced him of *her right* were not known to him till long after; up to this time he had only a conviction that she was ill-used *as to investigation*, that she had not had a fair hearing, and that Khutput was striving and hoping to prevent her having one.

But neither can Mr. Reid nor the Government claim to have considered Joitabaee when they refused to annul the guarantee; for it was on the 15th December that they came to that resolution, and on the 18th, three days afterwards,

they agreed to Captain French's suggestion, of a mode of adjudication which would have deprived her of our protection as effectually as though the guarantee had been withdrawn. Nar. 32.

Before finally dismissing the guarantee, thus incidentally introduced here, I ought to advert to Mr. Reid's argument at page 56, that since "Captain French, whom Colonel Outram describes as a mere tool in his native agent's hands, recommended to Government the entire withdrawal of the British guarantee," therefore there was no collusion between Nafra and Nursoo, and that their hostility, if any appeared, was not simulated, but real. The interest, however, of Nafra and his confederates in the guarantee was this; when there appeared a probability of their succeeding in their schemes of plunder, then it seemed their interest to strip the widows of the guarantee, although Nafra might lose it at the same time himself; but when there appeared no such probability, then the guarantee was invaluable as against the prince. Attention to these facts will easily show, contrary to Mr. Reid's argument, that Nursoo really served his friend Nafra (*i. e.* after such fashion of serving), when he proposed to Captain French to rescind the guarantee.

The subject-matter of the other case, that of Gorajee Pol, I do not here repeat, having already given it at page 78. In character it is very like the other, and in its history, as to Nursoo, it is very much mixed up with it. That Mr. Reid should still vindicate Nursoo in either of these affairs, after the legal scrutiny of Mr. Frere, and the unwilling degradation of Nursoo by the Government, is amongst the remarkable things of the book.

Page 35.—"The result was entirely exculpatory of Nursoo in Punt; and it established in my mind a conviction that this "was an attempt to make him the victim of an ordinary "party struggle, in which Furké had succeeded in involving "Colonel Outram."

This could not be so. It was not Furkey who sought Colonel Outram, but Colonel Outram who sought Furkey on finding he could not trust Nursoo. Had Nursoo been faithful, Furkey would never have had access to the Resident at all. Lord Falkland afterwards admitted that the reason for employing Furkey was satisfactory. 985-6.
The exculpatory result in Mr. Reid's mind relates to matters of which Nursoo was afterwards convicted.

Page 39.—"The petition itself, that of Dec. 21, which de- "scribed Nursoo's boasting of Mr. Reid's favour, is found in

"p. 951 of the Blue Book. It bears no date. Its very sub-
"stanee at once proclaimed it to be fictitious, as it finally
"proved to be. It would be monstrous if the Government
"ever placed the smallest reliance on such petitions, so as
"to allow them to influence its decisions. The petition bore
"a signature, and therefore was sent to the Acting Resident
"on the 4th January, 1849, in order that he might ascertain
"whether it came *bonâ fide* from the party whose name it
"bore. Captain French reported on the 9th January, 1849,
"that no such person was known at Baroda, and the petition
"was in consequence filed, under a minute of the 16th
"January, 1849."

The petition was sent for report on the very same day that the letter was dispatched which cleared Nursoo, and asked him to remain in office. If the petition were to have any weight, why was not the letter to Nursoo held back the few days required for scrutiny? If it were to have no weight, the reference was a mere form, as indeed Captain French seems to have understood it, when after one day's inquiry in a town of 80,000 souls he reported such a man as the petitioner could not be found. Nor did he resort to the usual practice of a posted notice. But the petition was "fictitious" only in the name appended to it; and it "finally proved to be" not only genuine in substance, but important. The real petitioner (a man of bad character, and an enemy of Nursoo, as Colonel Outram had reported) avowed himself after Nursoo had removed from Baroda to Ahmedabad. The evidence produced in support of its allegations was judged by Mr. Frere sufficient to convict Nursoo.

In page 41 Mr. Reid speaks of his "having prevented Nursoo being driven from office *unjustly*," just as though there had been no conviction of him by Mr. Frere, on evidence (not yet published) which wrung from the Government an unwilling confirmation. Of what avail is it to carp at the character of Jezram Hybutrow, and at his petition with a sham name according to the fashion of the country, now that the evidence ultimately adduced has superseded the original information?

It is not necessary to follow Mr. Reid in detail through the pages from 46 to 60, which he has devoted to the "Maurrice Letter;" the story has been given at page 45 of the present sheets. That Nursoo received that letter, that it was dispatched from Bombay to his address, January 4, 1849, and that it is correctly given in the Blue Books, are facts not disputed. The questions are, what use

did he make of it? and what inferences follow? This is important to Mr. Reid only as he chooses to defend Nursoo; for any person's name may be used in roguery by others, whether he will or no. Nursoo was convicted of having shown the letter, soon after he received it, to Muncherjee, a known friend of Furkey's, and indeed on the trial he admitted having done so. His object appears to have been to discourage his opponents at the juncture when Nafra's designs on Joitabaee most wanted support, and he himself was succeeding in affording that support. That he should have shown it to a known enemy, even to daunt him, just when he was also vaunting Mr. Reid's favour and his own designs, argues that he little feared any harm to himself in high quarters at Bombay, from his avowing himself a Khutputist; and herein, whether right or wrong, he only shared the belief of his neighbours.

Page 65.—"Nursoo Punt *may be* the greatest villain that the "corrupt soil of Baroda has ever generated; Baba Nafra *may* "*be* in the same category; all their friends and supporters "*may be* rightly placed in the same schedule; Jethabaee "*may be* an injured angel; Furké, a persecuted saint. But "when I consider the nature of the plots in the series of "dramas presented to us—the characters of the performers, "from His Highness the Guikwar and Colonel Outram down "to the lowest kolee—and the locality of the scene of action "—I am constrained to the conclusion that the justice of the "catastrophes has not yet been shown, and that the whole of "the matters treated under such circumstances remain still "involved in a deep shade of darkness and of doubt."

It is remarkable that throughout Mr. Reid's pamphlet there is not the slightest mention of the trial of Nafra by the Gaekwar's Court, of the Resident's investigation into that case, of the trial of Nursoo by Mr. Frere, of the evidence taken on any of those occasions, or of any of the findings or sentences. It cannot but be deemed an unhappy mistake, that after all those inquiries, conducted under judicial forms, and followed by sentences sanctioned by most unwilling authorities, Mr. Reid should speak as he does of the several parties mentioned in this quotation. Nothing could have given greater countenance in India to the constant boast in Baroda, that the reputation of Europeans of the highest standing are at the mercy of Khutputists.

906-4.

This error is the more to be lamented, because the fair probabilities of the case, if they had been let alone, would have

afforded ample inferences for Mr. Reid's protection. In the complication and often the haste of the business of an Indian Government, carried on in too many instances by unfaithful or incompetent agents, and under vast disadvantages both of a physical and social nature, that many errors should be committed is only to be expected; and no candid reader would have hesitated to admit that, in such circumstances, Mr. Reid might have done many things with the uncertain and imperfect information of the time, which on the fuller revelation and more connected statements now made, and with time for comparison and reflection, he might well regret, although he could not censure himself for them. It is, I conceive, only when he volunteers a defence of parties already condemned as well in judicial form as in universal opinion—parties who have paraded their reliance on him,—that he requires such a defence for himself as his pamphlet, vitiated with more than the errors I have pointed out, does not seem to supply.

It is, perhaps, most to be remarked that Mr. Reid never denies the general belief in the venality of the Bombay Government; he never accounts for that belief; he never denies that wrong has been done; and, if he ventures to speak for Nafra, he does not attempt to vindicate the later acts of the Government of Bombay. He says chiefly that if wrong has been done, *he* did not do it. But if wrong has really been done so great as appears to have been established by judicial proofs, and if the Bombay Government have been led, however innocently on their part, to aid or to permit it, the question is only removed a step by Mr. Reid's disclaimer or theirs. By what contrivance is it that a responsible chief of such an administrative system, if innocent, feels himself reduced to the necessity of defence, while the real wrong-doers lie safely concealed for many years together?

N.B. The following "Dissents" are amongst the papers ordered by Parliament, and are here given in anticipation of their publication by authority, which will probably be delayed by their being associated with a large mass of other documents. The despatch of 26th June, 1852, to which they so strongly object, was originally passed in a much stronger form by a very large majority of the Court, but was subsequently made such as it now appears by the overruling authority of the Board of Control.

27. Nar. 146.

DISSENTS *of various* DIRECTORS *of the* EAST INDIA COMPANY *from the Despatch of the Court, dated 26th June, 1852, to the Government of Bombay, on the Removal of* LIEUTENANT-COLONEL OUTRAM, *C.B., from the Office of Resident at Baroda.*

DISSENT OF W. B. BAYLEY, ESQ., AND EIGHT OTHER DIRECTORS.

We dissent from the Court's resolution of the 26th ult., ordering the Draft No. 482 to Bombay, in the political department, on the subject of the removal of Lieutenant-Colonel Outram from the Residency at Baroda, to be signed as altered by the Board of Commissioners for the Affairs of India,—

Because we consider that the words in paragraph 9, quoted in the margin,* which were approved by the Court on the 23rd ult., and subsequently cancelled by the Board, are essential to the complete exposition of the views of the Court on this important subject.

(Signed) W. B. BAYLEY.
CHARLES MILLS.
H. SHANK.
HENRY WILLOCK.
J. A. MOORE.
J. C. WHITEMAN.
E. MACNAGHTEN.
R. CAMPBELL.
W. H. SYKES.

I sign this Dissent because I object to the omission of the passage above quoted, which appears to me to take a correct view of the particular point to which it relates, although, for the reasons stated in my separate Dissent, I think that the Court has come to a wrong conclusion on the whole matter under its consideration.

(Signed) R. D. MANGLES.

I agree with the above sentiments,

W. J. EASTWICK.

* *India House,*
1st July, 1852.

* "But we regret that you did not take an early opportunity of pointing out to him the objectionable expressions which rendered him justly liable to your censure, and of enabling him to withdraw or modify those expressions. Such a course might have probably rendered the removal unnecessary, and might have secured the prosecution to a more complete and satisfactory issue, of the very important inquiries on which he was engaged."

DISSENT OF R. D. MANGLES, ESQ.,

Concurred in by three other Directors.

I dissent from the despatch to the Governor of Bombay in the political department (No. 20) which passed the Court on Saturday last, the 25th January,—

1st. Because it appears to me that Colonel Outram rendered to the Government of Bombay, and through it to the Government of India, a service of the greatest value, by denouncing, and, as far as he was permitted, by exposing a system of corruption, which, though in reality not extending beyond the underlings of the public offices, has, beyond doubt, deeply compromised the character of that Government in the estimation of its native subjects.

2ndly. Because although I strongly condemn the intemperate and disrespectful language which Colonel Outram allowed himself to use in addressing the Government of which he was the servant, I cannot but regard even his culpability in this respect as light in the balance when weighed against the zeal, ability, and fearless energy which that officer was bringing to bear upon the important object of his investigations, and which it was the bounden duty, as assuredly it was the interest, of the Government of Bombay to encourage and support.

3rdly. Because the circumstances of the case in general, and particularly the instances of Govind Row Roria and Nursoo Punt, commented on in our despatch, No. 19, of the 23rd ultimo, demonstrate to my mind that Colonel Outram did not receive from the Government of Bombay all the confidence and support which he deserved, and which a right view of the great importance of vindicating the purity of our administration in the opinion of the native community ought to have led the Government to extend to him.

4thly. Because it appears to me that a sufficiently generous allowance was not made by the Government of Bombay for the feelings of a zealous and high-spirited public officer engaged in a keen and arduous conflict with the crafty and unscrupulous agents and supporters of an inveterate system of corruption; and that this want of sympathy and consideration is manifested by the whole tenor of Lord Falkland's minutes, and more especially by the application by Mr. Blane of the expression "monomania" to those feelings.

5thly. Because I consider the proceedings of the Government of Bombay in removing Colonel Outram from an office where he was engaged in exposing the system of corruption spoken of in the foregoing reason, on the very spot where that system had its origin, and where its principal agents and abettors lived and acted, to have been eminently ill-timed and injudicious, inasmuch as that proceeding must necessarily have given a triumph to those persons whose malpractices Colonel Outram was endeavouring to bring to light and to punishment; and as it could not fail at the same time to generate a not unreasonable suspicion in the minds of the native community that the Government was not sincere in its professed desire to expose and put down the system in question.

6thly. Because, fully admitting the necessity of checking the disrespectful tone of Colonel Outram's correspondence, and of correcting his very erroneous view of the power and privileges of a Resident at the Court of a Native Ally of the British Government, it would appear to have been an easy and obvious matter to effect these objects without subjecting a most meritorious officer to severe loss and humiliation, and the public service itself to the heavy detriment pointed out in the fore-

going Reason, and inseparable from the course actually taken by the Government of Bombay.

7thly. Because, with the exceptions which I have stated, I consider that Colonel Outram acted rightly and in furtherance of the true honour and interests of the British Government of India, in all essential respects (to which category, in comparison with the vital importance of the real objects at stake, I cannot think that the admitted exceptions belong); and that with regard to whatever differences arose between that officer and the Government of Bombay in such essential respects, the superior authority was wrong.

8thly. Finally, because it appears to me that in the case before us the general policy and duty of supporting the Government falls into a secondary place in comparison with the paramount obligation upon the Court to take no step, and to allow no step to be taken, calculated to damp the spirit with which officers of high station and trust ought to be encouraged to maintain the honour and vindicate the character of our administration, when labouring under suspicion, or tending to afford even plausible ground for the continued prevalence of such suspicion in the minds of our native subjects.

Wherefore I am compelled to dissent from a despatch which appears to me to lose sight in a great measure of the great interest at stake, namely, the honour of the British Government of India; to censure heavily the zealous and honest public servant who was doing his utmost to vindicate that honour, for the lapses of respect and for an error of judgment, which, however gravely to be condemned, are of little importance, when compared with the vast moment of the one grand object in view; and to give at least implied approbation to proceedings on the part of the Government of Bombay, which appear to me to be of very questionable policy, and to be fraught with consequences most injurious to the character of our administration of British India.

(Signed) R. D. MANGLES.

India House,
1st July, 1852.

I concur in this Dissent,
W. J. EASTWICK.

I concur in this Dissent,
JOHN COTTON.

I concur also in this Dissent,
W. H. C. PLOWDEN.

DISSENT OF LIEUTENANT-COLONEL SYKES.

1. I dissent from the Draft No. 482, dated 24th June, 1852, on Colonel Outram's case, not less on account of the alterations made in it by the Board of Control against the sense of the majority of the Court, than on account of the feeble and inadequate expression, even in the original draft, of those vivid feelings and sentiments necessarily expected from the Court upon matters affecting the honour of the British name; equally also on account of the indisposition manifest in the draft to give due weight to Colonel Outram's explanations of his offensive bearing towards the Bombay Government, which explanations, if they do not justify his conduct, give a less offensive character to it.

2. A foul scandal had long pervaded the public press in India and the native mind, that parties connected with the Bombay Government were open to bribery by the Guickwar, his agents, or by the agents of Bankers, or others in Baroda and in Goozrat, for the purpose of effecting political or personal objects at the seat of power. It seemed, therefore, to be the imperative duty of the Bombay Government, conscious in the rectitude of the high officials connected with it, and jealous of the British name for purity in administration, to have taken the initiative in establishing the truth or falsehood of the degrading scandal which dated as far back as 1835. Nevertheless, Colonel Outram (then Captain Outram), Mr. Malet, Acting Resident at Baroda, and subsequently Mr. Sutherland, the Resident, in their arduous struggles to expose corruption, (if it existed,) felt that they laboured under great difficulties; and Colonel Outram, in his Khutput Report, now before the Court, Sect. ii. par. 3, says:—"The belief appeared to have its origin in certain decisions of Government respecting disputed successions which it was thought could only have been effected by bribery; and the leniency with which parties who were accused and were convicted, were treated by Government, strengthened the impression."

3. The various cases in which this leniency is supposed to be manifest, are arranged in chronological order in the Khutput Report; and it will suffice to give a passing reference to some of them. First, in the Umleara Succession case, when Colonel Outram took charge of the political agency in the Mahee Caunta, in 1835; then in Motee's case of perjury, 7th April, 1838; then in the Thakoor of Gorasur's case; then in a list of cases of bribery, forwarded to Government in a memorandum of Mr. H. Malet, in which the names of European gentlemen were used, 31st December, 1837. In this memorandum, and in a letter of Colonel Outram's to Sir Robert Grant, 1st January, 1838, nearly similar language is used: "Odium has in consequence (of bribery) been heaped on the British name, and a stigma has been attempted to be cast on the reputation of some of the most honourable and distinguished servants of Government."—Sect. v. par. 8. In the case of Anund Row, of the Political Agents' Office, who was suspended by Mr. Malet and restored by Government, 29th October, 1837, Sect. vi. par. 1; in the case of Dadoo Punt, 25th November, 1837, in which Mr. Malet was informed by Government, "nor is there any law by which native servants employed in the political department, guilty of receiving bribes, can be punished otherwise than by dismissal from the public service," 19th December, 1837; in the case of Motee Lall Purshotum, head Karkoon of Rajpeempla, 28th January, 1836, in which Mr. Courtenay is commended for the man's acquittal, and Mr. Malet is subsequently commended for his conviction; in the case of Brijlall, native agent, Baroda Residency, Sect. viii, implicated with Dadoo Punt, 25th November, 1837, and charged with bribery, in which the Government set aside the arrangements of Mr. Sutherland, the Resident at Baroda, which he thought necessary to insure the conviction of Brijlall, 28th March, 1838, and when he was ultimately convicted of receiving 4000 rupees, Government declined, 29th October, 1838, adopting Mr. Sutherland's urgent request that Brijlall should be publicly declared incapable of serving the Government in future; Government also prohibited further investigations: but in prosecuting Dadoo Punt, Brijlall was found to be implicated, 26th December, 1838, and was again convicted of bribery, and again Mr. Sutherland begged he might be proclaimed in the *Gazette*, and again the Government refused; in the case of the firm of Hurree Bugtee at Baroda, with British guarantee during good behaviour, but which lent itself to all the corruptions, Sect. ix. par. 4, et seq. The Government refused to sanction, 30th De-

cember, 1837, Mr. Malet's application to be allowed to insist upon the firm producing their books for examination, and censured his conduct at the same time, the Government under Sir George Arthur doing the very reverse in a similar case, in 1843, when Mr. Boyd was Resident, 13th July, 1843. On 26th October, 1838, Colonel Outram, then Captain Outram, wrote, Sect. x. par. 6, to Government, "All the exertions of the local officers to perfect the regeneration of Goozrat now in progress, and for the reform of abuses, must prove abortive so long as the Bombay Government is looked upon, *as it now is*, throughout this country, as patronising and encouraging a class of persons so notoriously and thoroughly proved culpable. Until Government has cleared itself from that imputation, the power to thwart our measures remains in the hands of a body of men" (the Nagur Brahmin family) "the most powerful, wealthy, and unprincipled in Goozrat, and that power to do evil can only now be stemmed by an immediate, distinct, and public declaration of the abhorrence with which Government regards the practices which have come to light, and of its determination to punish such offences with the utmost rigor in future." And he concluded: "I implore Government, if it consider I have by my former services established any claims to its consideration, as the only favour I have to ask at its hands, to receive my most earnest appeal by attending to its requests and overlooking aught that I have written, in the fervour of my feelings, that could in any way be deemed presumptuous or disrespectful." And he finally pledged himself to prove fifteen cases in which a strong bias on the part of Government appeared in favour of parties accused of bribery, Sect. x. par. 7. This was as far back as 1838.

The Guickwar, judging from these cases, followed in the same steps in 1840, in the notorious Dackjee Dadajee affair, and the very Motee Purshotum, previously convicted and dismissed, was employed in his corrupt practices. The Advocate-General, in his report to Government, 31st January, 1843, stated that the following sums were to be appropriated by the Guickwar to effect his objects:

	Rupees.
To Sir Jas. Carnac, 10 lacs	10,00,000
Mr. Willoughby	250,000
Mr. Reid	60,000
Shree Crustna	36,000
Dr. Browne and minor parties	100,000
Total	14,56,000

In 1838, Captain Outram left Goozrat, and joined the force proceeding to Affghanistan, and only returned to Baroda as Resident, when appointed by Sir George Clerk, in 1847. The former Residency agents of the Nagur family had been convicted and removed, but had not been *proclaimed;* and the feeling in the efficacy of Khutput remaining, it was soon found the new servants were as bad as the former, and parties who lent their aid to detect corruptions experienced their malice. In the case of Venaick Moreshwur Furkey, otherwise Baba Furkey, a servant of some years' standing, who had assisted Mr. Malet in his struggles against the corruption of his day,—this man, instead of progressive reward, had his office broken up, and a portion of its duties only offered to him on a diminished salary; and subsequently applying for the vacant office of native agent at the Residency at Baroda, being recommended by Colonel Outram, it was intimated by Government that he was not "a fit person to be employed in a political capacity," Part xi. Sect. xi. par. 15, although Colonel Outram found him almost the only man courageous and able enough to give him assistance in his inquiries into the practices of the Residency

agent, Nursoo Punt. Baba Furkey had been arrested and confined in his house by the Guickwar, with the knowledge of Captain French, the Acting Resident, and was only released on its being known that Colonel Outram was returning to Baroda. In consequence of these inquiries, Nursoo Punt proposed to resign on his pension, and Colonel Outram recommended Baba Furkey to Government as his successor; but Colonel Outram being obliged to leave Baroda on the 12th September, 1848, for Egypt, on account of health, on his return to Baroda, fifteen months afterwards, he found Nursoo Punt had withdrawn his resignation, and he himself had been reprimanded by Government during his absence for doubting Nursoo Punt's integrity, and for recommending Baba Furkey as his successor, 18th January, 1849. Colonel Outram, 22nd June, 1850, then asked Government to be allowed to investigate Baba Furkey's case, and was told, 6th October, 1850, that a previous decision of the Government was final; and even after a reference to the Court of Directors, the Bombay Government still refused, 28th June, 1851, to consider Baba Furkey's complaints. Then follow the details of the case of Nursoo Luximon, otherwise Nursoo Punt, late native agent at Baroda Residency. In 1843, Nursoo Punt gave up 400 rupees a month, as an assistant in the revenue branch of the Deccan, and obtained the office of Residency native agent at Baroda, on 300 rupees a month, quitting the best climate of Western India (the Deccan) for the worst (Baroda). Nursoo Punt was connected by family ties with several parties at Baroda, his sister being married into the family of Baba Nafra, and another into that of Dadoo Punt, whose misconduct has occasioned the notice of Government. Nursoo Punt concealed these family ties from the Resident and from Government. On the 21st March, 1844, Nursoo was charged with corruption on petition. It was referred by Government to Mr. Remington, Acting Resident, who said it was too late in the day to inquire into it. In 1847, Colonel Outram was appointed Resident at Baroda; his first impressions of Nursoo Punt were decidedly favourable, and for some time after his appointment he was ignorant of the family ties between Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra. But his suspicions were raised in the cases of Govind Row Guickwar and Gôrajee Pol, both against Nursoo Punt and Baba Nafra, in the first case by Nursoo Punt asserting ignorance of an important document in his possession, which he afterwards produced, and in the second case by his conniving at embezzlement of the Pol's revenues. Nursoo Punt, as previously stated, applied to be employed elsewhere, Colonel Outram having got the assistance of Baba Furkey, which aid, then given, has ended in his own ruin. Colonel Outram being obliged to leave Baroda on sick certificate for Egypt, Nursoo Punt withdrew his application for pension or other provision, and Colonel Outram still found him at Baroda on his return. The subsequent misconduct, conviction, and dismissal of this man, are discussed in the Court's despatch in the Political Department, No. 479, dated 23rd June, 1852. Then follows the Hurree Bugtee Guarantee question, in which Colonel Outram, on reaching Bombay, 17th September, 1848, personally urged on the Secretary to Government, and on one of the members of Government, that advantage should be taken of the frauds committed by the Hurree Bugtee firm to withdraw the British guarantee from it. This was not attended to, nor was a despatch of the Court on the same subject, 13th February, 1850. The subsequent ex-

Note.—Baba Nafra, the manager of the Baroda banking firm of Hurree Bugtee, had been convicted by Mr. Malet of nefarious practices; he had been mixed up in the conspiracy to bribe Sir James Carnac, and has since been convicted of the abduction of a son and heir of his late master, and of a foul conspiracy against one of his master's widows, Joitabaee.

posure of the atrocious proceedings in the Widow Joitabaee's case, the seizure of the papers of the banking firm of Hurree Bugtee, which led to the knowledge of the betrayal of Government and the Baroda Residency, by clerks communicating secret records; the tracing money to the hands of Government clerks in Bombay, particularly to Mr. Craig, of the Secret and Political Department; Government letting the matter lie from October, 1850, to the receipt of the Khutput Report, in November, 1851, and the trial and condemnation of Nursoo Punt, have been so lately discussed by the Court, that nothing more than mention of them is necessary.

On the 10th April, 1851, Colonel Outram (Part ii., Sec. iv. par. 11) wrote to Government that he had suspended four of his Karkoons, that he could prove that Nursoo Punt had received 28,000 rupees in Joitabaee's case, and accompanied the letter with a strong remonstrance. On his arrival in Bombay, he had an interview with the Governor, Lord Falkland, and *stated his perfect readiness to withdraw every statement or expression that might be regarded in the slightest degree as appearing to arraign the proceedings of his superiors*, and he assured his Lordship that nothing was further from his intentions than to treat himself or his Government with disrespect, and he expressed his desire to erase from his statement and letter every passage calculated to give offence. Lord Falkland intimated his approval of this resolution, and his hope that Baroda affairs would be settled to the satisfaction of all parties. Again, in the still unfinished investigation of the suspicions against the Baroda Minister for a purpose to bribe parties to get the charge for the Goozrat Horse withdrawn, Government refused to sanction a guarantee being given to Govind Row Roria, 23rd November, 1851, in case he gave evidence on the subject.

4. Because the Draft does not notice Colonel Outram's paper of suggestions of measures to guard against future corruptions, nor does it notice the rejection by Government of the whole of them. Sec. vi. par. 11, concluding sections.

5. As Colonel Outram's Khutput Report was the necessary result of the Government Circular of the 15th May, 1850, calling for information from subordinates, on the supposed belief in the native mind of the efficacy of bribery with Government officials, it was Colonel Outram's duty to trace the belief at Baroda from its origin. The terms, therefore, in the Minute of Council, 22nd November, 1851, applied to the Report and to Colonel Outram personally, of "Monster Report," "Monomania," and "it is impossible Colonel Outram in his right mind would persist," &c., seem misplaced and gratuitously offensive, and ought to have been noticed in my opinion, in the Court's Draft.

6. Because Lord Falkland, in his Minute of the 28th February, 1852, having said "we have not charged Colonel Outram with *disrespect* in any of his Reports, though I am far from deeming that we had no grounds for doing so, but only in his letter of the 31st October, 1851," it would seem the decision of the Court, on this branch of the subject, should be confined to this letter.

7. Because the Draft omits all mention of the present critical position of the parties who gave their assistance to Colonel Outram in the procuring the conviction of offenders, and does not suggest any measures to guard them against the sure prospect of persecution, and consequent personal damage to which they will be exposed.

8. Finally. Sufficient notice has been taken of cases, facts, and dates, without entering into elaborate details, to demonstrate in the clearest manner the comparatively eminent success of Colonel Outram, under the most embarrassing difficulties, in the praiseworthy and honourable efforts

to relieve the British Government from the scandal attached to its name of being indifferent to the corruptions of its servants and agents, and to discriminate and to fix upon the proper parties not only criminality, but the punishment due to criminality. It appears to me, therefore, that the Draft does not sufficiently dwell upon the eminent services and persevering zeal of Colonel Outram; that it does not make a natural and reasonable allowance for the irritation consequent upon finding his efforts for a great public object through a course of years constantly thwarted or inadequately supported; and above all, that it does not take that elevated tone befitting the character of a great Government in reprobation of corrupt conduct on the part of any of its servants, and in reproof of parties, however high their stations, whose apathy, prejudices, or misjudgment, may have led to the continuance of an odium and a scandal, which a vigorous manifestation, at an early period, might have either obviated or crushed at once. For the above reasons, I dissent from the Draft.

(Signed) W. H. SYKES.

India House,
7th July, 1852.

Woodfall and Kinder, Printers, Angel Court, Skinner Street, London.

COPY

OF A

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

LIEUT. COLONEL P. M. MELVILL,

Military Secretary to the Bombay Government,

AND

COLONEL JAMES OUTRAM, C.B.,

Political Resident, and Military Commandant at Aden.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES,

BY A FRIEND OF THE LATTER OFFICER.

PRINTED FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION,

BY

SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 65, CORNHILL, LONDON.

1854.

TO

JAMES ANDERSON, Esq.,

BRECHIN.

My Dear Sir,

To you, as one of the oldest and most esteemed of Colonel Outram's friends, I take the liberty of inscribing this Pamphlet.

You may perhaps consider that it was not required; that Colonel Melvill's *ex parte* publication should have been allowed to pass unnoticed. And had the assertions of that officer been confined to the ridiculously trifling matters which they profess to elucidate, there cannot be a doubt that such would have been the proper course. But as Colonel Melvill—the Military Secretary of the Government under which our friend serves—has seen fit to charge him, both in direct terms and by implication, with a meanness degrading to him as a man, it has been considered advisable to dispose of the accuser's allegations thoroughly, and conclusively.

This I have endeavoured to do in the form of an Introduction. In Part I. of the Introduction, I have detailed the circumstances under which the present publication has been *forced* on Colonel Outram's friends, as well as those which have prevented its earlier appearance; and in so doing, I have, I trust, enabled the reader to determine whether to Colonel Melvill or to Colonel Outram is more justly attributable the charge preferred by the former of an oblique and uncandid conduct of the controversy. In Part II. I have entered into the merits of the matter in dispute between the controversialists. And by copious annotations of their letters, I have established in detail the assertions contained in the Introduction. The first two letters remain unannotated, simply because I discovered that the notes requisite for the succeeding documents embraced every topic alluded to in the earlier correspondence.

If in the execution of my task, I have been compelled to write much that must be distasteful, and not a little that may prove humiliating to Colonel Melvill, to himself belongs the blame. For a hasty glance at the Introduction will satisfy you that he has pursued a course which compels Outram's friends, if they notice his assertions at all, to scrutinize them most closely. And I only regret that the treatment of these assertions should have devolved on one so little competent for the task. What I have written, has, for the most part, been penned on a sick bed, while labouring under an acutely painful malady; and I am conscious that all of it is feebly, and much of it confusedly, and obscurely written. Such as it is, however, I put it forth on my own personal responsibility. And though I refrain from appending my name to the title-page, Colonel Melvill may, if he desires, ascertain my identity by a reference to the publishers.

It is with deep and unfeigned reluctance that I have, from a sense of the duty I owe our friend, been constrained to write as I have. For there was a time when Colonel Melvill was one of Outram's staunch and earnest friends. To myself personally, he has, on more than one occasion, shown attentions, of which I retain a grateful recollection. And, further, though I covet no man's patronage, I am not insensible to the damage my own prospects are likely to sustain from thus coming into collision with one whose friendship is, throughout the Bombay Presidency, considered the passport to honour and emolument, and whose hostility has come to be regarded as an obstacle to preferment. But I have felt that I had a duty to perform to one to whom I am bound by the ties of affection, gratitude, and intense admiration, and whom I believed to have been unjustly and injuriously treated. And that duty I have endeavoured to perform to the best of my poor ability.

I remain,

My Dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

THE EDITOR OF THE CORRESPONDENCE.

August, 1854.

INTRODUCTION.

PART I.

In March 1853, a brief Memoir of Colonel Outram's Services was printed in London for private circulation. This Memoir was what it professed to be—simply a compilation. It was compiled from the Letters, Despatches, and General Orders of the Court of Directors, the Governors General of India, and the Bombay Government; from the Correspondence and Reports of high Indian functionaries; and from the works of various Authors whose writings had long been before the world.

In the execution of his task, the Compiler had the benefit of the friendly criticisms and assistance of several gentlemen of high position, both literary and official. And, were it necessary, *their* testimony could be adduced to prove that unusual care was taken to divest the work of every statement, not essential to its character as an exposition of Colonel Outram's services, that was considered in the slightest degree calculated to give offence. But further testimony than that which the Memoir itself affords is unnecessary. For no one acquainted with the recent history of India can fail to perceive that, in the sections which treat of the Affghan Invasion, the Conquest of Scinde, the Southern Mahratta War, the Politics of Sattara, and the intrigues which resulted in Colonel Outram's temporary degradation from the post of Resident at Baroda, the Compiler displayed a forbearance and tenderness to the feelings of others, barely compatible with the task which he had assigned to himself of detailing the series of remarkable services rendered by his friend.

It was, however, impossible to discuss questions which had been themes of controversy without the risk of offending those whose views and proceedings public opinion had unequivocally condemned. The Compiler, therefore, deemed it his duty to explain in his Preface that he had taken precautions which

rendered Colonel Outram *morally*, as well as technically, irresponsible for the contents of the book. And when, on its completion, he requested that officer to undertake its distribution—considering that the "Memoir" would be more highly prized by its recipients as a gift from its subject, than if presented by the obscure individual who had prepared it—he little thought that he was subjecting the former to a series of offensive attacks. But so it was. And, strange to say, these attacks have proceeded from an officer, out of a sensitive regard to whose feelings, and the feelings of certain of his friends, the Compiler of the "Memoir" had struck from his manuscript entire paragraphs, the publication of which would have afforded no *legitimate* grounds of offence. Colonel Outram's assailant was Lieutenant-Colonel P. M. Melvill, the Military Secretary of the Bombay Government; and it will be seen that from first to last his tactics have been of a very remarkable order.

Soon after the appearance of the "Memoir," some ingenious gentleman extracted from it, and forwarded to Colonel Melvill, an isolated passage, which, though it neither made, nor was intended to make the most remote allusion to that officer, was represented as designed to convey insinuations to his prejudice. The passage thus treated was, avowedly, a quotation from a work which a distinguished brother officer of Colonel Melvill had published twelve years before the "Memoir" was dreamt of, and which had excited considerable attention both in England and India. Not only had the Compiler of the "Memoir" indicated the passage as a quotation, by means of inverted commas, but he had prominently paraded the author's name in the text; while in a foot note he had given, in full, the title of the work from which he quoted, the publisher's name, the year, year of publication, and a reference to the page where the quoted words were to be found. Yet Colonel Melvill's correspondent—influenced, as that officer strenuously asserts, "*by a zeal for his friend's honour, and an honest desire that the truth should be known*"—contrived to impress his friend with the belief that the extracted passage had then appeared for the first time; and that it proceeded from the pen of the Compiler of the "Memoir," whose name he took care to communicate.

Under these circumstances, the imputed author of the obnoxious passage was obviously the proper object of Colonel Melvill's wrath. But he preferred assailing Colonel Outram. He assigned in justification of this rather illogical procedure that the Compiler of the Memoir was an intimate friend of its

subject; that the former had probably derived his materials from the latter; and that the latter "had presented the volume with his own hands to his friends." And, influenced by these weighty reasons for departing from conventional usage, he proceeded to fasten a controversial correspondence on an officer who had only just extricated himself from the embarrassments in which he had been placed by the persistent and unrelenting efforts of some of Colonel Melvill's friends to vilify his character, and to blast his prospects—but who *had*, much to the chagrin and consternation of more than one of Colonel Melvill's friends, emerged triumphant, from the unequal conflict.

On the 4th May, (1853) Colonel Melvill opened his fire. On that day he addressed to Colonel Outram the first of the subjoined letters, in which he not only adopted a tone well calculated to give offence, but indulged in statements and insinuations which were felt to be alike unfounded and unjustifiable. The tone of the letter Colonel Outram readily forgave, in consideration of the erroneous impressions under which it had been written. But its inaccurate statements and injurious insinuations he could not suffer to pass unnoticed. For, amongst other charges, they imputed to him the meanness of deliberately seeking to exalt his own reputation at others expense. And of the document containing these offensive imputations, Colonel Melvill acknowledged having furnished copies "to some of his friends both in England and in India,"—intimating at the same time that he would probably seek a wider audience.

In his reply, Colonel Outram expressed unfeigned astonishment at the interpretation put by Colonel Melvill on the complained-of passage. He assured him that it was an erroneous interpretation. He reminded him that the passage—taken from a work published in 1840 by one who was his own brother officer, neighbour, and personal acquaintance—had for twelve years passed unquestioned. And he exposed the unreasonableness of selecting it for vituperation at this late hour, and of putting on it a construction of which it had never before been deemed susceptible. Nevertheless, as Colonel Melvill considered it open to such a construction, he promised "to have the matter set in a correct light before all who had received copies of the Memoir." But, at the same time, he maintained the substantial accuracy of the passage, as a record of events. He repudiated and controverted the statements by which Col. Melvill had endeavoured to throw discredit on it. And he did

not conceal his regret that that officer should have failed to give him a list of the "friends" to whom he had submitted his Letter, and to whom it was no more than fair that the reply should be shown. But to these he could gain no clue. And as he was about to leave England, he was strongly recommended to take such measures as might enable his friends to do him justice in his absence. With this view, he printed his own and Colonel Melvill's letters. Of the Pamphlet thus constituted he took a few copies abroad, to present to any Indian friends he might ascertain to have seen Colonel Melvill's letter; and the rest he left behind, to be distributed by his wife, as soon as that officer should forward to her "the names and addresses of the friends in England," to whom he had submitted his own *ex parte* statements. For little did he anticipate that this modicum of information, solicited as "*a mere act of the barest justice*," would be withheld from Mrs. Outram, to whom he begged that Colonel Melvill would address any further communications he might wish to make in reference to the injury alleged to have been done him by the Compiler of the Memoir. He intimated that such "communications would be by her submitted to the friends empowered to act for him in his absence, who would most scrupulously consult what they knew to be his feelings." And, himself unwilling to pester his friends with controversial pamphlets, and believing that the correspondence would not greatly redound to Colonel Melvill's credit, he further added, that "if, on reflection, that gentleman should desire to have the injustice he assumed to have been done him rectified without a publication of the correspondence, he had only to intimate it to Mrs. Outram, when the Compiler of the Memoir would not be slow to give the fullest effect to his wishes and suggestions, consistent with the maintenance of what he knew to be the facts of the case."

A very mysterious, and to this hour unexplained, delay occurred in the receipt by Colonel Melvill of Colonel Outram's letter. That document had, however, come to hand by the 25th of August; and on the 27th, instead of communicating, as he had been requested, with Mrs. Outram—without even supplying to her the information which had been requested, as "*a mere act of the barest justice*,"—he addressed a second and still more offensive letter to her husband, of whose movements and destination, at that time, none of his friends in England or in India had any positive knowledge. For, although

under orders to proceed ultimately to Calcutta, he had received instructions to halt in Egypt; it being deemed possible that his services might be required in Turkey. This arrangement, well known to Colonel Melvill's brothers at the India House, could hardly have been unknown to his "regular correspondent," Colonel Ovans. It was, moreover, one which, like most official arrangements, had "leaked out;" it was reported in India by some of those who, having been the Colonel's fellow-passengers as far as Egypt, had there parted from him; and it was pretty generally understood in Bombay. There was, therefore, a strong probability that Colonel Melvill's letter would not reach Colonel Outram for many weeks—it might be months. And yet the writer intimated that he would "probably," before leaving India, (an event near at hand) publish "*all the correspondence that* HAS *passed;*"—in other words, that he would, "probably," print and circulate his second, and as yet unanswered letter, in which all the controverted allegations and insinuations of his first had been reproduced in an aggravated form. And it is well to observe, that although when he *did* adopt this unusual course, he professed to be solely influenced by a desire to give his own statements a circulation co-extensive with that of the "Memoir;"—he had meditated it at a time when, to quote his own words, "*so far as he could ascertain, no copy of the Memoir had been received in Bombay.*"

Colonel Melvill's letter was sent to the care of Colonel Outram's Bombay Agents, who of course detained it until they should receive some definite tidings of their constituent. And it so happened that they had not long to wait. For Colonel Outram, after a fortnight's sojourn in Egypt, received letters from Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, which led him to infer that there was little prospect of immediate hostilities, such as would justify the employment of British Officers; he accordingly departed for India; and the Bombay papers of the 3rd of September announced that he had passed Aden in the steamer which would, in ordinary course, reach Calcutta about the 11th or 13th of the month. The Agents lost no time in acting on the announcement. And nearly simultaneous with that announcement—one which the writer is in a position to *prove* excited considerable attention, and drew forth many surmises in high quarters at Poona, where Colonel Melvill then resided—seems to have been Colonel Melvill's determination to lose no

further time in printing and circulating his yet unanswered (and *unreceived*) letter of the 27th of August.

That letter reached Colonel Outram on the 14th September. On the same day printed copies of it were dispatched by Colonel Melvill, for circulation in England. Others were promptly distributed in Bombay. And, ere long, general publicity was given to several of its leading allegations in one of the Local Newspapers. On the 15th—the day after he had so singularly outmarched the officer whom he had chosen to treat as an adversary—Colonel Melvill intimated to the latter that he "*had* fulfilled the intention" expressed in his previous letter. And, adding that that letter (of the 27th of August) had been "sent to Leckie and Co. to be forwarded," he expressed a hope that it "*had reached in proper course;*" apparently failing to perceive that the earlier its receipt by Colonel Outram, the less justification could he himself plead for so precipitately putting it into circulation, a fortnight before he contemplated leaving India. For, slow as is postal communication in the East, there was time, had Colonel Outram replied even on the 15th of September, for his letter to reach Bombay, and to be hurried through the press, or at all events to be copied for the printer, before the evening of the 28th—the time fixed by Colonel Melvill for his departure. And if the letter had reached him "*in proper course;*" that is if it had come to hand, as Colonel Melvill seems to have "*hoped,*" about the 8th or 9th of September, an answer might have been "*anticipated*" about the 19th or 20th of the month. To complete the oddity of the whole transaction, Colonel Melvill intimated that he had forwarded ten copies of his publication to Colonel Outram, which he seriously requested that gentlemen to present to such individuals in Calcutta as might have received the Memoir.

On his arrival in Calcutta, Colonel Outram had many more important matters to attend to than a distasteful discussion about a mere trifle, the entire credit of his efforts respecting which he would willingly have made a present of to his assailant, had not his assailant's claims involved a charge of moral turpitude against himself. He was, moreover, not aware that Colonel Melvill contemplated so early a departure from India; and, ignorant of the mysterious delay that had occurred in the receipt of his own Letter by that gentleman, he saw no necessity for returning a very prompt answer to one who appeared to have devoted three weeks to the concoction of his last offensive communication. Thus it happened that, though

he received Colonel Melvill's Letter on the 14th of September, he did not find time to reply to it before the 24th. In his reply, he rebutted Colonel Melvill's various and ingeniously constructed allegations; but, in so doing, he explicitly declared that it was the last time he would take that trouble; for, so far as *he* was concerned, the correspondence was then "*closed.*" It consisted, as we have seen, of two accusative, and two vindicatory documents; and Colonel Outram intimated that he should forward to his publishers copies of the Letter on which he was engaged, and of the communication which had elicited it, with instructions to put them in type, and attach them to the printed Letters left by him in London. He announced that he would cause a copy of the Correspondence, thus equitably completed, to be presented to each recipient of the "Memoir:" and twenty copies to be placed at Colonel Melvill's disposal, which he relied on that gentleman "doing him the justice to supply to the parties to whom he had shown his Letter of the 4th of May." And in conclusion—*and in consideration of the Correspondence being "closed"*—he added, that he would direct his publishers to attach to the fasciculus any further "observations" that Colonel Melvill might wish to add in his own behalf; subject, however, to the very reasonable provison that "*should there be aught therein to call for comment, due attention thereto will be given, in a postscript, by the friends at home empowered to act for him.*"

Various interruptions prevented Colonel Outram concluding his Letter (a long one) before the 27th of September. And on that day, just as he was about to close it, he was astounded to receive Colonel Melvill's note of the 15th, intimating that he had already taken steps for the circulation, both in India and in England, of his yet unanswered Letter of the 27th August. On receiving this intimation, Colonel Outram added an indignant postscript to his Letter, in which, after reviewing the unpleasant features of Colonel Melvill's procedure, he characterized it as "*opposed to the straightforward procedure of a controversialist, conscious of a good cause.*" He, however, expressed his desire to draw a broad line of demarcation between his own conduct and that of his assailant. He would not, he said, follow the bad example that had been set him; and he illustrated his meaning by declaring that "*the pages of his pamphlet were still open to Colonel Melvill in the manner indicated in his Letter.*"

For Colonel Outram to have allowed the author of the

Letters of the 4th of May and 27th of August, to append "observations" to a Pamphlet designed to set himself right with those who had only seen Colonel Melvill's first attack, would have been rashly imprudent. To have done so, after what had recently occurred, would have been simply egregious folly. To give him permission to add a single "observation," subject even to the stipulated proviso, was an act of considerable generosity. Not so, however, thought Colonel Melvill, whom the Letter reached in London on the 18th of November. Regardless of the explicit refusal of Colonel Outram to conduct any further correspondence with him, he addressed to that officer a third Letter, still more offensive than its predecessors. This was dated the 23rd November. And on the 24th he sent a copy of it to Colonel Outram's publishers (in the midst of the bustle of a departing overland mail) with instructions to append it to the completed Correspondence they had been requested to print. In communicating these instructions, he quoted just so much of Colonel Outram's Letter as showed that he had permission to make additions to the pamphlet. But he kept silent as to the very distinctly-expressed proviso which Colonel Outram had attached to this permission. He failed to inform them that even the conditional permission had been solely accorded on the ground that the "Correspondence" was closed. And he concluded his communication with a strict prohibition against his Letter being shown to "any third party," until after publication, or until after it had been seen by Colonel Outram.

The publishers, Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co., had more important matters to attend to than the perusal of the controversial correspondence of their constituents. And ignorant of the merits of the case, and placing implicit confidence in Col. Melvill's honour, they recognised the authority cited by him as satisfactory, and his request as reasonable. They accordingly handed the letter to the printer. And but for an accident, Colonel Melvill's wishes would have been gratified; and a pamphlet published in Colonel Outram's behalf, and at his expense, and designed to neutralise the effects of Col. Melvill's previous efforts to injure him, would have been made the medium of carrying forth uncontradicted, and apparently under the *imprimatur* of his friends, a third offensive tirade against that absent and outwitted officer.

Happily, however, an accident *did* prevent this consummation. Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co. were grieved to discover

how nearly they had been induced to do a wrong to their constituent; and Colonel Outram's other friends held deliberation as to the course to be pursued. While they did so, Colonel Melvill, impatient to obtain copies of the letter, for the publication of which he had made these curious efforts, addressed the publishers. By them he was informed that they had no copies to give him. In very courteous terms, and with much delicacy, they reminded him that his former letter to their address had inaccurately described the arrangements it professed to communicate. And a hope was expressed, that under the circumstances, he would withdraw his prohibition against the letter being shown "to a third party." But the gallant Colonel was inexorable. He protested against postscript or comments of any kind being added to the Pamphlet, on the ground that such addition would interfere with its character as "a correspondence." And he could see but two courses open to the publishers. They must either violate their constituent's very explicitly recorded wishes, by converting the pamphlet into the means of circulating an uncanvassed diatribe against him; *or*, they must defer the publication until they had heard from Colonel Outram. In other words, they must play into Colonel Melvill's hands, by prolonging for three additional months the undue advantage he had already contrived to secure by the unimpeded circulation of his uncontroved statements.

To Colonel Outram's friends, however, it seemed that three courses were open to them. They might either refuse to print the letter, the publication of which had been so unwarrantably attempted—explaining in a preface their reasons for doing so: or they might gratify Colonel Melvill by publishing his letter, but at the same time apprize the reader of the circumstances under which it appeared, and invite him to draw his own conclusions therefrom: or they might defer the publication of the correspondence until they had heard from Colonel Outram. The last of the three plans involved obvious injustice to their absent friend; but under the circumstances, they deemed it the one most befitting his high character, and that most in accordance with his demeanour to his opponent throughout this controversy. They accordingly resolved to adopt it.

Colonel Outram's answer arrived in due course. It was such as his friends expected, and such as Colonel Melvill might have anticipated. He felt that an insult had been offered not only

Letters of the 4th of May and 27th of August, to append "observations" to a Pamphlet designed to set himself right with those who had only seen Colonel Melvill's first attack, would have been rashly imprudent. To have done so, after what had recently occurred, would have been simply egregious folly. To give him permission to add a single "observation," subject even to the stipulated proviso, was an act of considerable generosity. Not so, however, thought Colonel Melvill, whom the Letter reached in London on the 18th of November. Regardless of the explicit refusal of Colonel Outram to conduct any further correspondence with him, he addressed to that officer a third Letter, still more offensive than its predecessors. This was dated the 23rd November. And on the 24th he sent a copy of it to Colonel Outram's publishers (in the midst of the bustle of a departing overland mail) with instructions to append it to the completed Correspondence they had been requested to print. In communicating these instructions, he quoted just so much of Colonel Outram's Letter as showed that he had permission to make additions to the pamphlet. But he kept silent as to the very distinctly-expressed proviso which Colonel Outram had attached to this permission. He failed to inform them that even the conditional permission had been solely accorded on the ground that the "Correspondence" was closed. And he concluded his communication with a strict prohibition against his Letter being shown to "any third party," until after publication, or until after it had been seen by Colonel Outram.

The publishers, Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co., had more important matters to attend to than the perusal of the controversial correspondence of their constituents. And ignorant of the merits of the case, and placing implicit confidence in Col. Melvill's honour, they recognised the authority cited by him as satisfactory, and his request as reasonable. They accordingly handed the letter to the printer. And but for an accident, Colonel Melvill's wishes would have been gratified; and a pamphlet published in Colonel Outram's behalf, and at his expense, and designed to neutralise the effects of Col. Melvill's previous efforts to injure him, would have been made the medium of carrying forth uncontradicted, and apparently under the *imprimatur* of his friends, a third offensive tirade against that absent and outwitted officer.

Happily, however, an accident *did* prevent this consummation. Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co. were grieved to discover

how nearly they had been induced to do a wrong to their constituent; and Colonel Outram's other friends held deliberation as to the course to be pursued. While they did so, Colonel Melvill, impatient to obtain copies of the letter, for the publication of which he had made these curious efforts, addressed the publishers. By them he was informed that they had no copies to give him. In very courteous terms, and with much delicacy, they reminded him that his former letter to their address had inaccurately described the arrangements it professed to communicate. And a hope was expressed, that under the circumstances, he would withdraw his prohibition against the letter being shown "to a third party." But the gallant Colonel was inexorable. He protested against postscript or comments of any kind being added to the Pamphlet, on the ground that such addition would interfere with its character as "a correspondence." And he could see but two courses open to the publishers. They must either violate their constituent's very explicitly recorded wishes, by converting the pamphlet into the means of circulating an uncanvassed diatribe against him; *or*, they must defer the publication until they had heard from Colonel Outram. In other words, they must play into Colonel Melvill's hands, by prolonging for three additional months the undue advantage he had already contrived to secure by the unimpeded circulation of his uncontroved statements.

To Colonel Outram's friends, however, it seemed that three courses were open to them. They might either refuse to print the letter, the publication of which had been so unwarrantably attempted—explaining in a preface their reasons for doing so: or they might gratify Colonel Melvill by publishing his letter, but at the same time apprize the reader of the circumstances under which it appeared, and invite him to draw his own conclusions therefrom: or they might defer the publication of the correspondence until they had heard from Colonel Outram. The last of the three plans involved obvious injustice to their absent friend; but under the circumstances, they deemed it the one most befitting his high character, and that most in accordance with his demeanour to his opponent throughout this controversy. They accordingly resolved to adopt it.

Colonel Outram's answer arrived in due course. It was such as his friends expected, and such as Colonel Melvill might have anticipated. He felt that an insult had been offered not only

to himself, but to those friends to whom (and not to his publishers, as Colonel Melvill very well knew,) had been assigned the task of protecting his interests in England. And he did not care to conceal that he regarded his correspondent's conduct as not only unfair, but inconsistent with his ostentatiously paraded professions. He "*peremptorily declined*" to answer any more of Colonel Melvill's letters on the same subject; and he intimated that he would direct his friends in England to deal with that gentlemen's last letter "*as they thought proper.*" He would not withdraw the provisional permission previously accorded to Colonel Melvill to add "remarks;" but he explicitly informed Colonel Melvill that these remarks would only be inserted on the stipulated conditions. And he privately requested his friends to scrutinize somewhat closely whatever Colonel Melvill might chose to add. For he was painfully sensible of his inferiority to Colonel Melvill in controversial adroitness; he was conscious, moreover, that he had in his former letter failed to point out several of his assailant's fallacies; he had neither the inclination, nor the means, to carry on a war of pamphlets; and he was therefore desirous that advantage should be taken of the present opportunity to dispose, once and for all, of the matters in dispute.

In anticipation of Colonel Outram's instructions, an edition of the Correspondence had been prepared, illustrated with a few short notes and a brief preface. This was put in type. But, influenced by several considerations, his friends resolved not to publish it. For, as Colonel Melvill had contrived that his own *ex parte* edition should have half a year's unimpeded circulation, it seemed doubtful whether, after such a lapse of time, any one would take the trouble to look at another. It had been ascertained, moreover, that in some quarters Col. Melvill and his Pamphlet had been voted a bore; that in some they had been laughed at; and that in some they had awakened feelings very different from those it had been desired to evoke. Weight also was given to the consideration, that as Colonel Outram had just gained a signal victory over strenuous efforts to injure him in more serious matter, made by certain of Colonel Melvill's friends, he might well be held excused from noticing less formidable attempts. And as numerous applications had been made to the Compiler of the Memoir for a new edition of that little book, it was considered that the most dignified mode of repelling Colonel Melvill's attacks would be to do so in the body of the work which had been controverted. The most dignified mode

seemed also the most satisfactory. For, by re-writing the Chapters on the Affghan Invasion, Sattara Politics, the Southern Mahratta War, and Bombay "Khutput," it would be in the Compiler's power not only to vindicate what had been called in question by Colonel Melvill, but to throw some light on the miserable hostility (addicted to subterraneous operations) which has for the last few years been displayed towards his friend in certain other quarters, both in India and in England. The idea of publishing the Correspondence was therefore discarded. But Colonel Melvill pursued a course which compelled its re-entertainment.

. Disregarding the twice expressed determination of Colonel Outram not to engage in further controversial correspondence —and equally indifferent to the very supererogatory declaration he had himself made in his *third* Letter, that he would shed no more ink on the subject—he saw fit on the 21st of March to address a *fourth* communication to that officer, which the latter regarded as gratuitouly insulting, and suspected to cover a controversial artifice. Amongst other things, the writer affected—or seemed to affect—to believe that Colonel Outram was still desirous of prolonging the controversy; and he benevolently offered to gratify him, on the condition that the correspondence should be conducted directly, and not through the medium of "a third party." In other words, he replied to Colonel Outram's indignant protest against the obstacles he had unwarrantably thrown in the way of an early publication of the equitaby completed Correspondence, by a bland offer to postpone its publication indefinitely, by continuing to write letters, none of which could be answered in less than three months. And that, too, in reference to disputed points for the settlement of which he had himself declared that every shred of necessary evidence had been adduced.

Whether Colonel Melvill really expected that Colonel Outram would deign to notice this epistle, it is not for the Editor of the Correspondence to affirm. But, most assuredly, there are few who will venture to say that it deserved a reply. And no one who takes the trouble of referring to it can fail to perceive that it would form an admirable termination to a pamphlet published in Colonel Melvill's interest; or that, circulated by itself, it must needs impress the reader with the belief that Colonel Outram had been thoroughly worsted in the conflict; and that, conscious of his inability to hold his own, he had endeavoured to extricate himself from his difficulties by thrusting his pen into the hands of a proxy.

Colonel Outram left the Letter unanswered. He enclosed it to the present writer, with a pungent expression of his opinions; and in doing so, he re-iterated his request that his friends would exercise their own discretion as to the best means of protecting him against further annoyances from the same quarter. They would gladly have negociated with Colonel Melvill, with a view to an amicable adjustment of a dispute which, originating in a mistake, and easily susceptible of a satisfactory solution, had been rendered complex solely through certain hastily-rendered statements of that officer. And they had little doubt that a ten minutes' conversation would have made all right. Colonel Melvill had, however, so peremptorily repudiated the interference of "any third party," that only three courses were open to them. They might drop the subject altogether; or they might instruct the Compiler of the Memoir to remodel that little book in the next edition, so as to meet Colonel Melvill's charges; or they might publish the Correspondence, with such notes and comments as should enable the cursory reader—and only such reader could be looked for—to perceive how weak and untenable was Colonel Melvill's position. The first of these plans was that most agreeable to their own views and feelings. But they had received information respecting the language held by certain partisans of Colonel Melvill, which, viewed in connection with the tone of that officer's last letter, satisfied them that their silence was likely to be misrepresented. They considered that the Compiler of the Memoir could not do justice to the subject until it had been seen whether Colonel Melvill and Sir H. Pottinger, (who had been very unnecessarily dragged into the controversy,) intended to confirm, by failing to retract, the declarations to their own prejudice, which the former had rashly made, and the latter had hastily sanctioned.* And it was, therefore, resolved to recast and amplify the Preface and Notes originally written, and to issue the Correspondence in the present form.

* In Part II of this Introduction it will be seen how very unnecessarily Colonel Melvill has gone out of his way to justify an unfavorable criticism of his own and Sir H. Pottinger's proceedings. The subject is more fully treated in the long note appended to pages 59—62.

PART II.

Having explained the circumstances under which the publication of this Pamphlet has been forced on Colonel Outram's friends, it only remains to add a few observations on the subject matter of the dispute between that officer and Colonel Melvill.

The controversy is based on the following passage, which occurs at page 57, of the "Memoir of Colonel Outram's Services," so often referred to:—

"On the 21st of November, 1838, the Bombay division of the army, destined for the invasion of Affghanistan, under Sir John Keane, sailed from Bombay *en route* to Scinde; and on the 27th it reached the Hujamry mouth of the Indus, in the confident expectation of being able, without delay, to prosecute its onward march. But it was doomed to disappointment. The nature of its embarrassments, and the manner in which it was extricated from them, are explained in the following passage from Dr. Kennedy's very interesting narrative.*

"'Our halt on the banks of the Indus was prolonged to December 24th, solely on the want of camels and boats, which had been promised to be ready against our arrival. These were not only not ready, but the local authorities at Kurrachee had prevented the merchants from sending 800 camels which they had engaged. * * * * * The unparalleled activity and energies of Captain Outram had, however, been devoted in aid of those who ought to have foreseen and provided against these difficulties. He left the anchorage at the Hujamry, and proceeded to Mandavie, whence he travelled to Bhooj, and laboured at the Cutch Durbar to carry points which should neither have been left to this late hour, nor yet left to his management. Having surpassed all expectation in what he was able to effect, he re-embarked at Mandavie, and sailed to Kurrachee, where he landed; and, travelling across the country, rejoined us at Tatta."

"'To him chiefly, if not entirely, was it to be attributed that on the 22nd (December) it was reported that a sufficient number of camels had been collected, and orders were given to the Army to advance in two divisions.'"

Those "in aid" of whom Outram's "activity and energies had been devoted," were Sir John Keane and his colleagues in

* "Narrative of the Campaign of the Army of the Indus in Sind and Cabool, in 1838," by Richard Hartley Kennedy, M.D., late Chief of the Medical Staff of the Bombay Division of the Army of the Indus. Bentley, 1840, pp. 63-64.

the Government, to whom had been assigned the duty of arranging for the advance of the Bombay column. And Dr. Kennedy meant to imply that these personages should have "*foreseen and provided against*" the very natural repugnance of the Ameers of Scinde to furnish the boats, camels, and provisions, which they had been induced to promise. He conceived that instead of risking the success of an expedition, which Her Majesty's ministers considered of Imperial importance, by relying for the means of moving the Army on princes whom we were harshly coercing, timely arrangements should have been made by the Bombay authorities, through the political officers in the neighbouring province of Cutch, for such a supply of "carriage" from that country as would have enabled the troops to advance on debarcation. And he thought it little creditable to his official superiors that, from neglect of such arrangements, it was found necessary to dispatch Outram to Cutch in quest of the means of moving the troops, at a time when they ought to have been on their way to Hydrabad.

Colonel Melvill, however, could only recognise in Doctor Kennedy's words—erreonously attributed by him to the compiler of the Memoir—calumnious insinuations against the political officers of Cutch;—against Colonel Pottinger, who, though our envoy in Scinde, was also Resident for Cutch; and against himself, who, as Colonel Pottinger's senior assistant, was in temporary charge of the Cutch Residency, at the date of Sir J. Keane's arrival in Scinde. The passage he declared to have been intended to charge both his chief and himself with "*incompetency for the offices they held, and dereliction of the duties they had to perform.*" And in the fervour of his indignation at such an unwarrantable attack, he saw fit to characterize the description given of Outram's services, as a tissue of consummate fictions—"*a false statement, false in fact, and false in the inference attempted to be drawn.*" In one place he writes—"It is unnecessary for me to say to *you* that you never laboured at the Cutch Durbar." In another, he declares that Outram did "*nothing.*" And throughout his correspondence he repeatedly charges that Officer, either in direct terms or by implication, with the contemptible meanness of refusing to contradict statements which he *knew* to be utterly false.

Let us ascertain how far the only evidence available tends to justify Colonel Melvill in the employment of such language.

Sir John Keane landed at the mouth of the Indus on the 27th November, 1838, in the expectation of being able to

make an immediate advance. On the 28th, he was waited on by Captain Eastwick, then on Colonel Pottinger's political staff, and now one of the most honored of the East India Directors, who informed him that the Ameers had made no arrangements either for transporting or provisioning the troops; and that the only contribution which had been levied from Cutch, consisting of 500 camels, was still detained on the Scinde frontier, by one of the Scinde Ameers, Shere Mahomed. These are historical facts which admit not of cavil. And no less certain is it that, on the 29th, Sir John Keane, intensely irritated, (as well he might be), at the absurd and mischievous position in which he then found himself, sent a special messenger to Cutch. The messenger selected was Captain Outram, the only officer on his personal staff possessed of Indian experience —one therefore whose presence could be ill spared. And so pressing was the object of Outram's mission that he was dispatched in the only vessel at Sir John Keane's disposal, on which he could rely for maintaining the communications of the Army.

It happens that the only available source of information respecting Outram's proceedings in Cutch, is a "diary," kept by him during his campaign, and afterwards published at the request of his friends. But there are circumstances connected with the history of that diary, which, apart from the high character of its author, render it a completely trustworthy reference in the present dispute. For it was printed immediately after the conclusion of the operations which it records, and while these were still fresh in the public recollection. It was circulated by the author amongst those who, having been his comrades during the campaign, were in a position to detect any exaggerations. The extreme meagreness of the description given by Outram of his Mission to Cutch, sufficiently shows that he never contemplated founding on that event any claims to merit, or distinction. The fact of his having sent the volume to Colonel Melvill, and solicited that officers opinion of it, before allowing it to be reprinted in England, proves that he was unconscious of having mis-stated the object, or the results of his visit. And we have, in Colonel Melvill's second letter, the admission that, though in 1840 he read Outram's brief record of his proceedings in Cutch, he never, in the most distant manner, hinted to the writer the slightest doubt of its accuracy, until in 1853, he ad-

dressed to him the angry missive which initiated the present correspondence.*

The meagre entries, in which Outram recorded his mission to Cutch, occur at page 2 of his Diary, and run as follows:

"November 29th. Dispatched by the Commander in Chief, in the Constance Schooner, on a mission to Cutch, to procure assistance in land and water carriage, &c.—1st. December. Anchored at midnight off Mandavie.—2nd. Landed in the morning, found Captain Ward, one of the Resident's Assistants, at the Palace: arranged with him for the dispatch to the army of boats, forage, and sheep; in the evening left for Bhooj; travelled there on camels and horseback.—3rd. Arrived at Bhooj at daybreak, forty miles: arranged with Captain Melvill, Assistant Resident in charge, for the supply of five hundred additional camels, five hundred having been already sent off, via Luckput Bunder, and four hundred pack bullocks to be shipped at Mandavie. Visited the Rao at noon to convey Sir John Keane's remembrances and good wishes, and received cordial messages from his Highness in reply. In the evening returned to Mandavie.—4th. Breakfasted with Captain Ward at Mandavie: found that twenty-two boats had been dispatched the day before with forage and sheep: engaged more boats for the conveyance of pack-bullocks, and to tow the "Mootnee" Indus boat, which, as she was lying useless at Mandavie, I took on myself to place in requisiton. Sailed the same evening."

Instead of returning direct to Army head quarters, Outram proceeded to the Scindian seaport of Kurrachee; selecting this circuitous route, for the double purpose of procuring camels, and of ascertaining the disposition of the people. At Kurrachee, he found the Belooch Governor actively engaged in frustrating the efforts of our Native emissaries to obtain "carriage;" but by remonstrances, threats, and an explanation of their inutility, he succeeded in putting a stop to these proceedings. Prosecuting his journey, he arrived next day at Gharry Kôte, where Colonel Pottinger's Hindoo Agent—Nao Mull—was vainly endeavouring to obtain a fulfilment of their engagements from a body of camel men who had previously promised to furnish their cattle for the use of the Army. Influenced by the threats and false reports which Scindian officials had been industriously promulgating, these men had refused to implement their promises; but Outram's sudden presence amongst them, and the pledges which he gave them in the name of

* Outram's Diary, was published in 1841, by Richardson, of Cornhill, and bore the following title:—"Rough Notes of the Campaign in Scinde and Affghanistan, in 1838-9, being Extracts from a Personal Journal, kept while on the Staff of the Army of the Indus. By Major James Outram, 23rd Regiment N.I. now Political Agent in Scinde."

the Commander-in-Chief, changed the aspect of affairs. Three hundred camels were forthwith dispatched to camp; two hundred more were started next day; others followed; and the aggregate thus obtained, amounted to somewhere about twelve hundred camels.

On the 11th of December, Outram reached the British Camp. On the 19th, the five hundred camels which had been so long kept in detention on the frontier, came to hand. On the 22nd, it was reported that sufficient means of transport had been collected to enable the troops to advance. And though it is very certain that without the five hundred camels the advance could not have been made, few, probably, will question the accuracy of Dr. Kennedy's statement, that to Outram "*chiefly, if not entirely,*" was due the credit of setting the Army in motion; and that his activity and energies had been successfully devoted in aid of those who ought to have foreseen and provided against the difficulties which beset Sir John Keane on his first arrival in Scinde. It appears doubtful, from Colonel Melvill's letters, whether the four hundred pack-bullocks, and the large fleet of boats requisite for their transport to Scinde, and intended, after their arrival in Scinde, for the conveyance of stores up the Indus, which that officer had *promised* to Outram, were sent in proper time, or indeed whether they were ever sent at all. But if they were not sent, the fault was none of Outram's. And it admits of no doubt whatever, that the Army *had* the benefit of the fleet of twenty-two boats dispatched (on Outram's requisition,) from Mandavie on the 3rd December; that it was further reinforced by the additional boats secured by him on the 4th, for the purpose of towing the "Mootnee," to the Indus; and that in the "Mootnee" itself it received a most valuable accession to its means of transport. For that large "*Flat*" alone sufficed to convey almost the entire Siege Park, and Magazine of the Army.

Apparently insensible to the force of these considerations, and afflicted with the idea that Dr. Kennedy and the compiler of the Memoir intended to imply that Outram's mission to Cutch was necessitated by Colonel Melvill's neglect of his duty, the latter declares that, though he may possibly not have pointed out the error to the former, he always did regard as a very grave error the passage in the Diary in which allusion was made "to arrangements made in Cutch about carriage." And he very unnecessarily reiterates in more than one place, the burden of the following appeal:

"I never received from you, as you well know, the slightest "assistance; you were never in a position to aid me or to co-"operate with me in any manner."

No one had ever the most remote intention of hinting that Outram was sent to Cutch to "assist" the local political officer; "to aid him, or to co-operate with him in any manner." He was, on the contary, sent to *procure* assistance and co-operation. He did so. If, as Colonel Melvill's letters seem to indicate, Outram did *not* receive as much assistance as it was in the power of the local political officers to afford, the fault was none of his. And few will be inclined to consider it any derogation from the value of his services, that, (as Colonel Melvill very truly observes,) the boats, &c., obtained at Mandavie, where "procured by Captain Ward, *and not by Outram personally;*" and that (as he adduces the evidence of a Commissariat Officer to prove) "*the camels that came from Cutch, were accompanied with detailed statements under Colonel Melvill's signature of the sums of money to be paid to the respective Jemadars, &c.!*" Nor will the candid reader regard as very pertinent to the question of what Outram did *prior* to Sir John Keane's first movements, any argument of Colonel Melvill's based on the fact that he "*afterwards* dispatched large quantities of carriage to Scinde, to assist the the march of the Army as it advanced," without any assistance from Outram! Until the publication of this Correspondence, no one doubted that Colonel Melvill had, so soon as application was made to him, laboured with enthusiastic earnestness to supply Sir John Keane's deficiencies. But now that Correspondence *has* been published—now that we have it on Colonel Melvill's authority, that the whole resources of Cutch had been, from the first, most liberally placed at his disposal, and that on him and Colonel Pottinger had rested the responsibility of applying these resources to the service of the Army—the future historian of the Affghan War will find considerable difficulty in vindicating the conduct of these gentlemen. He will record that, from first to last, only from two to three thousand camels in all were derived from Cutch. And he will reason gravely on this fact, when detailing the serious embarrassments experienced by Sir John Keane from deficient means of transport, when departing from the banks of the Indus he could no longer avail himself of the boats which Outram's zeal had procured for him. For these embarrassments, on more than one occasion, were on the verge of pro-

ducing a rupture between the Military and the Civil Chiefs, and of producing a miscarriage of the expedition.

So much for the extent to which Dr. Kennedy was justified in narrating that to Outram "chiefly, if not entirely," was it due that Sir John Keane was, on the 24th December, enabled to extricate himself from a predicament in which he should never have been placed. Let us examine into the justice of the assertion, made by the same writer, that Outram "carried points at the Durbar which should neither have been left to that late hour, nor yet left to his management." By this assertion, as we have seen, Dr. Kennedy meant that the assistance of the Prince (Rao) of Cutch should have been obtained by the Bombay Government, through the agency of the local officers, in sufficient time to have obviated Sir John Keane's detention; whereas Outram had to be sent to solicit it, at a time when the Army ought to have been on its march towards Hydrabad. But Colonel Melvill declares that the author's intention was to charge Sir H. Pottinger and himself with incompetence and direlection of duty. And, labouring under this conviction, he denounces the entire statement as a shameful fiction—"*false in fact, and false in the inference attempted to be drawn from it.*"

Whether or not the expression used by Dr. Kennedy was *critically* correct, is open to dispute. But that it conveys a *substantially* accurate account of what took place, admits of little doubt.

There is, unfortunately, no entry in Outram's Diary which enables us to determine what actually passed at the Durbar on the occasion of his visit to Bhooj. For, in preparing his little volume for publication, he abstained from recording in this—as in all his other references to the official interviews to which he was admitted by exalted or important personages—the conversation that took place, or the arguments that were adduced. And at the date of going to press, the writer of these remarks has not received the Journal from which the Diary was "extracted." Luckily, however, this is not of much importance; for in Colonel Outram's Letters we have distinct declarations of what occurred; and in Colonel Melvill's attempts to gainsay them, a complete confirmation of their accuracy. In the Diary, as has been seen, Outram confines himself to a brief statement of the complimentary nature of his visit to the Rao. And, availing himself of this fact, Colonel Melvill—who not only denies that Outram addressed appeals to the Rao for speedy and extensive supplies of carriage, but presumes flatly

to contradict Outram's assertion that he was instructed by Sir John Keane to make such appeals—exultingly writes:—"It is remarkable, that in your Diary no mention is made of *anything* but 'remembrances and good wishes,' and of 'cordial messages in reply;' *and this agrees exactly with my own memory.*" But Colonel Melvill's memory had played him false when he wrote these words. For he elsewhere not only admits that "*mention was made of the want of carriage for the Army,*" but taunts Colonel Outram with having unsuccessfully urged that contracts should be made for pack-bullocks with certain Brinjarries, "*and that the country should be* 'DRIVEN' *for camels.*" He tells us that the Prince, moved by the "mention" made of the wants of the Army, offered to compel his Chiefs to hire out their herds to the Commander-in-Chief; and that (in spite of a remonstrance from Outram) he himself begged his Highness (in the name of the British Government) not to think of such a measure; moved thereto by certain "*relations*" then pending between the Durbar and the petty Wagur Chiefs, which rendered it "*highly inexpedient,*" in his opinion, to avail himself of the royal offer.

Relying on the evidence thus furnished by Colonel Melvill, that Colonel Outram availed himself of his interview with the Cutch ruler for other purposes than the mere delivery and receipt of complimentary messages, the reader will, probably, have little difficulty in accepting the assurance of the latter of those officers that he made "strong appeals to his Highness in the name of the Commander-in-Chief for speedy and extensive aid." To suppose that he was not *ordered* to do so, would be absurd. For it is simply *incredible* that Sir John Keane, whose contempt for the puppet Princes of India is well known, should, when chafing under his annoying and humiliating detention on the banks of the Indus, have sent complimentary messages to the Prince of Cutch, except as the medium of a demand for boats, and baggage cattle. No one who knows Outram's character could for a moment suppose that, charged with orders to "appeal for speedy and extensive aid," he failed to do so—earnestly and energetically; even had not Colonel Melvill himself furnished adequate grounds for assuming that appeals *were* made. It is moreover difficult to imagine that any other motive than a determination to address such appeals to his Highness, would have induced Outram—to whom Native Princes were neither novelties nor rarities—who had spent the previous night in effecting a journey of forty miles, principally

on camel back—and who had the prospect of spending the next night in the same unrefreshing manner—to leave a comfortable house at noontide, that he might repair to the palace. And it is preposterous to suppose that a Prince who had *already* placed the entire resources of his country "*most liberally*" at Colonel Melvill's disposal, for the use of Sir John Keane's Army, would have thought it necessary to offer (as Colonel Melvill tells us he *did* offer) to compel his Chiefs to surrender their entire herds of camels "*if the British Government desired it*"—unless VERY STRONG appeals had been made by Outram.

After what has been said in reference to the disputed facts, the reader will probably regard as supererogatory any attempt to vindicate Colonel Outram from the charge urged against him by Colonel Melvill, of basely, by his silence, sanctioning the reiterated publication of "*false statements*," designed to magnify his services at the expense of the reputation of others. Yet there are one or two points in connection with this charge which deserve notice.

In his first Letter Colonel Melvill wrote:—

"I know that it has, before this, been publicly stated that the carriage which enabled Sir John Keane's force to move from Gorabarree, was obtained by you, and by means of your exertions. In your '*Rough Notes*' you alluded to arrangements made with me in Cutch about carriage; and I think (but as I deemed the matter of little moment, I am not sure,) that I pointed out that this was a mistake when you sent me the volume, and asked my judgment upon its contents. * * * * The Bombay newspapers have also, from time to time, repeated the same erroneous story; and if you ask why I have never before contradicted it, I reply that I have naturally felt the reluctance which most men I conceive would feel to put forward their deeds; and moreover, I have always looked upon what I did upon the occasion in question, as only done in the line of my proper duty, and no more than any public officer under the same circumstances would have done, without laying claim to any particular meed of praise for so doing. These are my reasons for the silence I have hitherto maintained; *but, at the same time, I must own frankly that on each occurrence of the tale falsely told by your friends for the purpose of enhancing the merits of your services, I have looked for a contradiction from yourself, and have felt regret for your sake rather than for my own, that in this expectation I have been disappointed.*"

Now, even on the assumption that the Bombay newspapers *had* erred when they attributed to Outram the credit of having extricated Sir John Keane from his embarrassments, it cannot be pretended that they were guilty of *any* injustice to Col. Melvill. And of all human beings *he* would have had least reason to look regretfully on Outram's silence. For, by his own showing, he had literally done *nothing* towards Sir John's extrication from

these embarrassments. And if his assertions and admissions are to be accepted as more than the hasty and ill-advised utterances of an angry man, Dr. Kennedy would perhaps have been justified in directing against *him* the censures he bestowed on higher and more important personages. For, not satisfied with declaring that the resources of Cutch had been most liberally placed at his disposal, and that on himself and his Chief had, from the very first, rested the responsibility of applying these resources to the service of Sir John Keane's Army, he maintains that he was in close communication with that Officer at the date of Outram's visit; that he was fully apprised of all "his requirements and wishes;" and that the *direct* road between Cutch and the British Camp then was, and continued to be, "perfectly open and uninterrupted." And yet, great as were his avowed responsibilities, and singular the facilities he boasts of having enjoyed for acquitting himself of these responsibilities, he does not allege that, between the 2nd December, when he became aware of Sir John Keane's embarrassments, and the 24th, when Sir John was at length enabled to break ground, he contributed aught to his stock of carriage, beyond the five hundred camels which had been despatched before the embarrassments arose; and which, having been sent by a route *not* "perfectly open and uninterrupted," did not reach the Camp until eight days after Outram, "having surpassed all expectation," had rejoined the Army. Nor is this all. He confesses that he endeavoured to prevent Outram from proceeding to Bhooj—urging him "to return to Scinde without delay"—the object of his mission unaccomplished. He avows, that with the view of persuading him to do so, he wrote to him that "everything to be done in Cutch had already been done, or was in progress;" although nothing *had* been done beyond the despatch of the five hundred camels above adverted to; and although the "Mootnee" and the large fleet of boats of which Sir John Keane stood so painfully in need, had been allowed to lie idle, and were still lying idle, in Mandavie harbour. As we have already seen, he boastfully asserts, that when Outram, in spite of his dissuasives, proceeded to Bhooj, he frustrated at least two of that Officer's efforts in behalf of the Army—negativing his recommendation of a contract with the Brinjarries—and declining (in spite of Outram's remonstrances) the offer made by the Rao to enforce a levy of camels. And he further seems to admit—or rather exultingly to imply—that he never sent the four hundred pack-bullocks which, as

shown by his Diary, Outram understood to have been promised.

Such are Colonel Melvill's declarations and admissions. If one tithe of them be credited, it is very evident that there was little scope for "*the reluctance to put forth his deeds*," for which he now takes credit. And his conduct during the twelve or thirteen years he describes himself as having been unfairly treated, is certainly a psychological marvel.

He explicitly informs us that he did not become an intimate friend of Colonel Outram until some years after that officer's visit to Cutch, in December 1838. We may, therefore, assume that the warm friendship which for several years he professed for Outram was contracted subsequent to his perusal of the "Rough Notes." And if it is odd that, when asked his opinion of that work by a mere acquaintance, he hesitated to point out what he considered an inaccuracy, it is still more extraordinary that he should have cherished the friendship of a man who had published what he knew to be an erroneous statement—of a man so base, that, though the Bombay newspapers from time to time unjustly assigned to him the credit of having set Sir John Keane's Army in motion, he abstained "on each recurrence of the tale falsely told by his friends for the purpose of enhancing his merits," from giving it the contradiction that was looked for, and the absence of which was a cause of regret to the injured officer. Were it necessary, some additional and rather curious psychological peculiarities on the part of Colonel Melvill might be adduced. But enough has been said on this branch of the subject.

Colonel Melvill is a gentleman of consummate ability, of varied accomplishments, and, by common consent, remarkable for official aptitude and sagacity; and, perhaps, if placed in the positions from time to time occupied by Outram, he would have achieved an equal celebrity. But, it has been ordained that the opportunities of distinction offered to the one, should be denied to the other. It is, therefore, simply ridiculous to allege that, were Outram's ambition so inordinate as to remain unsatisfied with the brilliancy of the fame which he has acquired, he could possibly view such a reputation as that of Colonel Melvill with a jealous or a covetous eye. And it is still more ridiculous to suppose, that by attributing to Outram the release of Sir John Keane's Army from its detention on the banks of the Indus, the compiler of the Memoir, or any other of Outram's friends, hoped to enhance the reputation of

the Officer who had organized the Bheel Corps, and converted a set of hitherto intractable savages into the faithful guardians of that peace they had so long disturbed—of him, who in two years had reduced the Mahi Kânta, so long the scene of chronic anarchy and perennial outrage, to peace and order, "without taking a single life, except in the field, or depriving a single person of his estate"—of him who was, while only a Brevet Captain, held up to the Army as a brilliant example of what an Indian soldier should be, by one of the most distinguished (Military) Governors that Bombay has possessed—of him who, long before he visited Affghanistan, had been officially reported to the Court of Directors, by another Governor, as "one of the first military officers under the Presidency"—of him, of whom a third Governer declared that he should ever regard the day of their mutual introduction, as "one of the brightest spots in his career of life"—of him who, in the words of one of the most distinguished of Indian functionaries, "carried to Affghanistan, in 1838, a character, such as could not be paralleled by any officer of his standing in India"—of him, who after numerous gallant feats, and many valuable though unrequited services to the Army, commanded the pursuit of Dost Mohammed, one of the most brilliant and chivalric incidents of the Affghan war—of him, who after a further series of military and diplomatic services, was selected by the Governor General of India, in January 1840, to fill the very post which Colonel Melvill's chief had occupied in December 1838—of him, who in the course of a few more months, was appointed to the political control of the whole of Scinde and Beloochistan, and who, "when the European inhabitants of Calcutta trembled for our Empire, when in the highest places men grew pale at the evil tidings from Affghanistan, held his frontier post with a firm hand, a brave heart, and a cheerful tone that *ought* to have been contagious," and who "had the moral courage to sacrifice his own immediate interests by stemming the then prevalent tide of cowardly counsel"—of him, in whom the heroic Clerk has declared that he recognizes the performer of services not second to his own—of him, of whom two Presidents of the Indian Board, successively attested in the House of Lords, in reference to these very services, that "to no man in a public office was the public under greater obligations, that a more distinguished servant of Government did not exist, *nor one more eminent in a long career*"—of him, of whom the greatest living authority on Indian affairs, Mount-

stuart Elphinstone, has recorded that "besides his ample share in the planning and conduct of various military enterprizes, his political services for several years had been such as it would be difficult to parallel in the whole course of Indian diplomacy!" But why prolong the catalogue of services which are now imperishably recorded in the living page of history. Enough has been said to show the absurdity of the supposition that Outram or his friends could possibly regard the boats and camels procured by him for Sir John Keane's Army, as "*enhancing his merits*"! The incident was only alluded to in the Memoir because it was found neatly and succinctly narrated, in a work of reputation which had been long before the public; and because it *illustrated* one of the leading features in Outram's character,—an intense earnestness of purpose, invariably expressing itself in promptitude of action.

The thing itself was intrinsically so trivial, that its establishment has been undertaken on the present occasion, only because, in controverting Dr. Kennedy's assertions, Colonel Melvill has seen fit to bring charges of moral baseness against his distinguished and chivalric brother officer.

CORRESPONDENCE,

&c.

MAHABULESHWUR, 4*th May*, 1853.

MY DEAR OUTRAM,

In a letter which I received by the last Mail, I am told that Dr. Ogilvie has published a Memoir of your Services, and the following passage from it has been quoted to me:—

"The unparalelled activity and energies of Captain "Outram had, however, been devoted in aid of those "who ought to have foreseen and provided against "those difficulties. He left the anchorage at the "Hujamree and proceeded to Mandavie, whence he "travelled to Bhooj, and labored at the Cutch Durbar "to carry points which should neither have been left "to this late hour, nor left to his management. Having "surpassed all expectation in what he was able to "effect, he re-embarked at Mandavie."

I am slow to believe that such a statement can possibly have been put forth with your knowledge, or with the sanction of your authority, for you must be sensible that it is directly opposed to truth; and it also conveys a serious imputation on my character, which I would fain hope cannot have emanated from you, with whom, for many years past, I have been associated in the public service on terms of intimacy and mutual regard.

It is unnecessary for me to say to *you*, that you never labored at the Cutch Durbar; that there were no points at that Court, or in that country, left undone when they ought to have been done, or left to your management when you visited Bhooj in December 1838. But to prevent the least doubt being raised upon the subject, I will succinctly relate, and thus recal to your memory, all that actually *did* occur on that occasion.

You came to Mandavie in the *Constance*, and wrote to me, then at Bhooj in political charge of the province, to report your mission. I told you in reply, that everything to be done in Cutch had already been done or was then in progress, and I advised you to return to Sind without delay. You wished, however, to visit me at Bhooj; and I consented to take you to the Durbar to deliver a complimentary message from Sir J. Keane to the Rao. In the course of our conversation with His Highness, which did not last above half an hour, mention was made of the want of carriage for the army, and you offered one or two suggestions which I put aside as, in my opinion, inexpedient. One of these was to enter into contracts for pack bullocks with certain Brinjaries; and another was to use the power of the Rao to force the Wagur Chiefs to surrender for our use all the camels in their possession—to *drive* the country in fact. Both of these propositions I negatived, for reasons which were afterwards perfectly approved. You passed the remainder of the day in my house with my family, and in the evening you returned to Mandavie, whence you re-embarked, taking with you, I believe, a few boats provided by my Assistant, the late Captain Ward.

I cannot at this moment cite exact dates, as I have not the official papers with me, but it must have been fully three weeks before you entered the province, and, indeed, long before you left Bombay, that I had despatched five hundred camels for Sir J. Keane's force. These I had provided under the instructions of Sir H. Pottinger, and by means of the Durbar influence and resources. The march across the Delta was found to be somewhat more difficult and more tedious than was anticipated, but the detachment reached Sir J. Keane very soon after his disembarkation; and it was this detachment, as the late Colonel Macdonald wrote to me by desire of the General, that enabled the force to make its first move from the mouth of the Hujamrie river. I afterwards, under the same instructions and by the same means, despatched large quantities of carriage into Sind, to assist the march of the army as it advanced; but I never received from you, as you well know, the slightest assistance; you were never in a position to aid me, or to co-operate with me in any manner; nothing whatever was done in Cutch, or at the Cutch Durbar, by your advice or by your management; your interference was never called for or authorized, and most assuredly would not (unauthorized) have been tolerated by me for an instant.

I know that it has, before this, been publicly stated that the carriage which enabled Sir J. Keane's force to move from Gorabasee was obtained by you, and by means of your exertions. In your "Rough Notes," you alluded to arrangements made with me in Cutch about carriage; and I think (but as I deemed the matter of little moment at the time, I am not sure,)

that I pointed out to you that this was a mistake when you sent me the volume, and asked my judgment upon its contents. In Kaye's "Affghanistan" the error occurs more glaringly, but this I never saw until a few days ago:—"A supply," it is said, "of carriage from Cutch, obtained by the energetic exertions of Captain Outram—a supply by no means adequate to the wants of the force, but most welcome at such a time—came opportunely to release Sir J. Keane from this local bondage, and the Bombay column then commenced its march into Sind." The Bombay newspapers have also from time to time repeated the same erroneous story; and if you ask why I have never before contradicted it, I reply that I have naturally felt the reluctance which most men I conceive would feel, to put forward their own deeds: and, moreover, I have always looked upon what I did upon the occasion in question, as only done in the line of my proper duty, and no more than any public officer under the same circumstances would, I believe, have done, without laying claim to any particular meed of praise for so doing. These are my reasons for the silence I have hitherto maintained; but at the same time I must own frankly, that on each recurrence of the tale falsely told by your friends for the purpose of enhancing the merit of your services, I have looked for a contradiction from yourself, and have felt regret, for your sake rather than for my own, that in this expectation I should have been disappointed.

Had the statement now promulgated in Dr. Ogilvie's Memoir, been confined, as the former statements have been, to the erroneous assertion that carriage was obtained from Cutch by your exertions, I might pro-

bably have continued to treat it with indifference; but your eulogist, in his eagerness to elevate your merits, has impugned and disparaged my character as a public officer; for not content with re-asserting the imaginary fact of your labours in Cutch, and their fictitious consequences, he has described you as effecting by your activity and energy, that which ought to have been effected by others, and effected before you were called upon to act at all; thus imputing to me (and to those others) incompetency for the offices we filled, and a gross dereliction of the duty we had to perform.

This is a false statement—false in fact, and false in the inference attemped to be drawn—which I cannot suffer to pass unnoticed. The character of others, as well as my own, is involved. It was Sir. H. Pottinger's duty to direct—it was mine to carry out—the measures by which the resources of Cutch, most liberally placed at our disposal by the Rão, were to be applied to the service of the force under Sir. J. Keane in Sind. To those who know Sir. H. Pottinger, and to all who have served under him or with him, it is superfluous for me to say that no precautions suitable to the times, or practicable, were omitted—that his instructions were comprehensive, clear, and far-reaching. To myself, it is sufficient satisfaction to me to recall the full and entire approbation of all my superiors, which I received for my share in the eventful transactions of the period. But as you had no concern whatever with the performance of any of the duty which devolved upon me, as the officer in charge of the Political Agency in Cutch, I trust that you will see the propriety of disavowing the statement which transfers to you, and to your name, the credit (if credit there

be) belonging to another, and to which you cannot, with the least show of justice or of truth, lay even the shadow of a claim.

I have not yet seen a copy of the Memoir, and until I know how far it has been circulated, I cannot determine whether or not I may be compelled, however reluctantly, to publish this refutation of a false statement affecting my public character. But in the meantime, I shall send copies of this letter to some of my friends both in England and India, to whom I most desire that the truth should be clearly apparent.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

P. M. MELVILL.

44, CURZON STREET, *23rd June*, 1853.

MY DEAR MELVILL,

I reply to your Letter of the 4th May, which I received late the day before yesterday.

In that Letter you complain that you and others are injuriously affected by a statement, reported to you as having been made in a recently printed Memoir of my public services. That statement you characterize as false. And you express a hope that it could not have emanated from myself—doing so, however, in a manner which seems to imply your apprehension that the hope thus expressed rests on no safe foundation.

When I inform you, that the passage in which the obnoxious statement occurs, and which you have

quoted *in extenso* in your letter, is, and professes to be, an extract from the work of your personal friend Dr. Kennedy, (published in 1840), you will, I think, admit that I have some reason to complain of the correspondent on whose communication you proceeded to address me. And when I further apprize you, that, in his preface, the writer of the Memoir of my Services has explicitly alluded to the precautions which he took to render me morally, as well as technically, irresponsible for the contents of his little book—you will probably arrive at the same conclusion as myself regarding the *animus* of the individual on whose representations your letter was based.

As regards the extract from Dr. Kennedy's Narrative, the reproduction of which, twelve years after its publication, has excited your wrath, I beg most solemnly to assure you, that it never once occurred to me to put on it the construction of which alone you say it is susceptible.. I do not believe that Dr. Kennedy—your own personal friend, and the friend of Sir Henry Pottinger—meant to charge on either Sir Henry or yourself "incompetency for the office you filled," or "a gross derelection of the duty you had to perform." I do not believe that any considerable number, if indeed any, of his readers viewed his remarks in that sense. Nor do I believe that one single human being in Bombay attached to his remarks the interpretation which you conceive them to bear. For though you practically deny having, yourself, read Dr. Kennedy's book, many of your Presidency friends must have done so; none of them could have so far neglected their duty as to fail to bring to your notice what they regarded as an imputation on your official character; and that you

were ignorant of any such imputations having been cast on you by Dr. Kennedy, is sufficiently proved by the terms of intimacy and friendship in which you continued to asociate with each other in Bombay, from 1840 till his departure in (I think) 1843—as well as by the fact of your assuming that the offensive passage dates no earlier than 1853. And I can positively assert, that some of your warmest friends in this country did not, in 1843, regard the passage in question in the light in which it now appears to you; for when, by their advice, I agreed to submit to the Court of Directors testimonials of various kinds, and derived from various resources, Colonel Barnewall and Captain Pontardent, who superintended their compilation, introduced the very remarks which now prove a source of annoyance to you. And unless my memory greatly deceives me, I forwarded to you a copy of the collection, containing the obnoxious passage. At all events, I am all but certain that I presented a copy to your brother, and to others, your personal friends in the India house. And up to the present hour, I have received from none of them the slightest hint that the remarks alluded to were understood to reflect in the slightest degree on the character—official or personal—of Sir H. Pottinger or yourself.

In respect of the *precis* which you give of "all that actually did occur," when in December 1838, I was, as my published diary states, "despatched (from Sind) "by the Commander-in-chief" (Sir J. Keane) on a "mission to Cutch to procure assistance in land and "water carriage"—you write;—

"You came to Mandavie in the '*Constance*, and "wrote to me, then at Bhooj in political charge of the

" province, to report your mission. I told you in reply " that everything to be done in Cutch had already " been done, or was then in progress, and I advised " you to return to Sind without delay. You wished " however to visit me at Bhooj; and I consented to " take you to the Durbar to deliver a complementary " message from Sir J. Keane to the Rao."

Had "everything to be done in Cutch" been effected, or been known to be in such a state of progress as to satisfy the requirements of Sir John Keane, my mission would have been unnecessary. And if, charged with a specific mission from the Commander-in-Chief, I had acted on your advice " to return to Sind without delay," instead of executing his orders, I should have been guilty of gross dereliction of duty. My Chief's orders were, to explain to you his straitened condition—to entreat you to strain your influence to the utmost in his behalf—to deliver a complementary message to the Prince, at whose court (in the absence of Sir Henry Pottinger) you officiated *pro tempore* as British Representative, and, in doing so, to urge His Highness to exert himself more effectually than he had hitherto done, in supplying the army with the means of prosecuting its onward march. And had you ventured to frustrate the object of these orders, by failing to introduce me to His Highness, you would have been guilty of a flagrant violation of *your* duty, and have received a severe and well-merited display of Lord Auckland's displeasure. You did not, however, expose yourself to the charge of lukewarmness for the public service. You received me with a hospitable welcome, which effectually concealed from me the fact, more than implied in your

present letter, viz., that you regarded my mission with feelings akin to mortification. And you introduced me to the Rao, as I thought, with cordial readiness.

In reference to that interview you write: "In the "course of our conversation with His Highness, which "did not last above half an hour, mention was made "of the want of carriage for the army, and you offered "one or two suggestions, which I put aside, as in my "opinion inexpedient. One of these was to enter "into contracts for pack bullocks with certain Brinja-"ries: and another was, to use the power of the Rao "to force the Wagur Chiefs to surrender for our use "all the camels in their possession—to *drive* the coun-"try, in fact. Both of these propositions I negatived, "for reasons which were afterwards approved."

"Mention," you say, "was made of the want of carriage for the army," and you might have added, that strong appeals were addressed by me to His Highness, in the name of the Commander-in-Chief, for speedy and extensive aid. But you err somewhat in saying that I recommended the country to be "*driven*" for camels. I too well knew the value of camelmen arbitrarily forced into service. Nor were such extreme proceedings necessary. With a thoroughly hearty and cordial desire on the part of the Rao to aid us, no such measure would have been necessary. The Chiefs would have hired out their camels to us without "force;" and I cannot account for the interpretation put by you on my requests. However, be this as it may, the results of my visit to Bhooj were thus stated in my Diary, published in March, 1840. (*Vide* page 2, of my "Rough Notes.") "Arranged with Captain "Melvill, Assistant-Resident in charge, for the supply

"of five hundred additional camels, five hundred "having already been sent off *via* Lukput,—and four "hundred pack bullocks, to be shipped at Mandavie. "Visited the Rao at noon to convey Sir John Keane's "remembrances and good wishes, and received cordial "messages from His Highness, in reply."

The now alleged inaccuracy of this statement you say you think you once pointed out to me. I most solemnly deny that you ever did so, or that you objected to any other passage in my book, on any single occasion, or in the most distant manner. Had you done so, it is not very likely that I would have allowed my Diary to be republished in London without making some allusion to your objections. And if I had been guilty of conduct so unjust, and so uncourteous, after having, as you yourself admit, "sent you "the volume and asked your judgment on its contents," it is very unlikely that we should have remained, as we continued to remain, on terms of intimate personal friendship.

In continuation of the passage from your letter last quoted, you thus proceed:—

"You passed the remainder of the day in my "house, with my family, and in the evening you re-"turned to Mandavie; whence you embarked, taking "with you, I believe, a few boats, provided by my "assistant, the late Captain Ward."

The results of my negotiations with Captain Ward, who like yourself was one of my personal friends, continuing so till the hour of his death;—and who like yourself never once hinted that the entries in my published Diary were not merely substantially, but literally correct—are thus detailed in that Diary, page 2.

" 1st December. Anchored at mid-night off Man-
" davie. 2nd. Landed in the morning, and found Cap-
" tain Ward, one of the Resident's Assistants, in the
" palace; arranged with him for the dispatch to army
" of boats, forage, and sheep; in the evening left for
" Bhooj. * * 4th. Breakfasted with Captain Ward
" at Mandavie; found that twenty-two boats had been
" dispatched the day before, with forage and sheep;
" engaged more boats for the conveyance of pack
" bullocks, and to tow the *Mootnee Indus* boat, which,
" as she was lying useless at Mandavie, I took
" upon myself to place in requisition. Sailed in the
" evening."

In one sense, and in one only, could the late Col. Macdonald have been justified in saying that the five hundred camels sent to you from Cutch, enabled the army to advance. Without these camels it is probable that the advance could not have been made on the 24th of December; but these camels dispatched by you, according to your own statement, "long be-
" fore I left Bombay," (*i. e.* the 22nd November), did not reach our camp till the 19th of December—and not until two days after a drove of one thousand camels had been procured in Sind, in a great measure through exertions and representations made by myself; (*Vide* "Rough Notes," page 5). Without these, the supply sent by you, before the expedition sailed from Bombay, would have been utterly useless. I do not, therefore, under these circumstances, conceive that our friend Kennedy mis-stated the facts of the case, when he declared that to myself—"chiefly, if not entirely, is
" to be ascribed the merit that on the 22nd (Decem-
" ber) it was reported that a sufficient number of

" camels had been assembled;"—he having previously intimated that a very large portion of the camels " procured for the army were received from Kurra- " chee," and obtained in a great measure through my own personal exertions. Nor do I conceive that, even without this explanation, the passage cited in the " Memoir" of my public services implies, or can be justly held to imply, that to myself is due the credit of procuring those five hundred Cutch Camels, which though dispatched by you, in obedience to Sir Henry Pottinger's orders, prior to the sailing of Sir John Keane's expedition from Bombay, on the 22nd November 1838, only reached our camp on the 19th of the following month. But as you seem to entertain a different opinion, I shall take measures to have the matter placed in a correct light before all who have received copies of the memoir of my services. Nor shall I rest content with this. I shall intimate to Mr. Kaye the exception you take to the passage from *his* History of the Affghan War, quoted by you in your letter. I shall request that gentleman, in the preparation of the next edition of his book, to obviate the misconception which you think the passage in question is calculated to awaken; and I shall do so the more heartily, because, now that you have directed my attention to it, I must admit that it may not unreasonably be supposed to imply that *all* the contributions to our stock of " carriage," which were derived from Cutch, were due to my exertions.

I have now, I think, noticed the most important points in your letter; and I do not choose to comment on the tone of a communication evidently written under strong, and I trust evanescent, feelings. Should

I, after consultation with my friends, deem it necessary to trouble you with any further remarks, I shall transmit them to you by next mail.

In the meantime I have to request that, in bare justice to myself, you will either furnish copies of my present letter to those Indian friends to whom you have submitted your letter of the 4th of May, or at least intimate to them that that document was written under misconceptions, and that you wish it to be considered as withdrawn. In respect of those of your friends in England to whom you have forwarded copies of your letter, I think you are bound not only to furnish me with their names and addresses, but to request them to give as extensive a publicity to my reply as they have done to the letter which called it forth.* By my reply, I do not necessarily mean the present scrawl; for I am very unwilling to engage, or to appear to engage, in any controversy with you. And if after taking counsel with your brother, I can see my way to some satisfactory means of setting myself right with those who have read *your* letter, without publishing the entire correspondence, I shall gladly avail myself of it.

Deeply regretting that any such correspondence should have arrisen between us.

I remain,

My dear Melvill,

Yours truly,

J. OUTRAM.

* I leave for Calcutta on the 4th proximo, but any communication addressed by you to my wife, (through Leckie and Co.) will be, by her, submitted to friends whom I have empowered to act for me in my absence, and who will most scrupulously consult what they know to be my feelings regarding you.—J. OUTRAM.

[The three following Letters will show that the prolongation of the controversy was not the fault of Colonel Outram.]

44, CURZON STREET,
28th June, 1853.

MY DEAR OVANS,

I enclose for your perusal, proofs of a Letter which I received from Melvill, under date the 4th ultimo, and of my reply, dated, the 23rd instant.

Before handing these letters to the Printer, I waited on both Mr. J. C. Melvill and Mr. P. Melvill, in the hope that they might suggest some arrangement which would supersede the necessity of publishing a correspondence that was calculated, I believe, to be more unpleasant to your brother than to myself. To neither of them had Melvill sent a copy of his letter of the 4th May; and they both declined to undertake the perusal of the correspondence, on the ground that they were averse to being made parties to any controversy that might arise between your brother and myself.

Under these circumstances, I directed the letters to be printed—intending to take out with me to India, a sufficient number of copies to circulate amongst those to whom I might find Melvill's letter had been submitted. The rest I designed leaving in England, to be disposed of as my friends might deem necessary on learning from Melvill the extent of publicity already given to his letter in this country. This arrangement I intimated to Melvill in a letter intended to go by the next Mail—and which concluded with the following paragraph:—

"Should you, on reflection, desire to have the injustice which "you assume to have been done to you rectified without a publication "of the correspondence, you have only to intimate it to my wife; "and I feel assured that the compiler of the 'Memoir' of my "services, will not be slow to give the fullest effect to your wishes "and suggestions, consistent with the maintenance of what he knows "to be the facts of the case."

This Letter I proposed printing along with the rest; but before doing so, I thought it well to submit it to the criticism of his brothers. I accordingly went to the India House yesterday forenoon. Mr. J. C. Melvill was not to be found; but Mr. P. Melvill suggested that before taking any further steps, I should place myself in communication with you, as his brother's regular correspondent.

If you will consent to act as Melvill's friend and representative n this matter, I shall be most happy to correspond with you in that

capacity; and you will, I trust, find neither in my friends or myself, any want of alacrity to render the fullest justice to your relative, and to meet all reasonable wishes you may choose to express on his behalf. By using the word "reasonable," I mean to exclude the supposition that either my friends or myself will consent to anything less than the withdrawal of Melvill's letter, or the alternative of giving to my reply (or such *precis* of its substance as may be agreed upon) a circulation equal to that afforded to the letter which elicited it.

As my time is limited, and my engagements pressing, an immediate reply will greatly oblige,

Yours very sincerely.

(Signed) J. OUTRAM.

30, GLOUCESTER SQUARE, HYDE PARK,
28th June, 1853.

MY DEAR OUTRAM,

I have just received your Letter of this date, with its enclosures, which I now return.

As I know nothing of the merits of this case, I am, of course, unable to enter into any correspondence or discussion regarding it; and as you have written to Melvill yourself on the subject, it appears to me that the decision, as regards the points noticed in your Letter to me, had better now be left to Melvill himself.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) C. OVANS

44, CURZON STREET,
29th June, 1853.

MY DEAR MELVILL,

My Letter to Ovans, which you will find following my Letter to your address of the 28rd instant, will sufficiently explain to you my own feelings on the subject of our correspondence.

It only remains for me to ask, as a mere matter of the barest

justice, that you will cause to be communicated to my wife, by the earliest possible opportunity, a list of all those to whom your Letter has been, or is intended to be shown.

I have, I conceive, a right to be informed who the correspondent was, who—whether intentionally or unintentionally—has virtually been guilty of misrepresentation, and who has thereby induced you to address to me such a Letter as yours of the 4th May,

Believe me,

Yours truly,

J. OUTRAM.

POONA, 27*th August*, 1853.

MY DEAR OUTRAM,

1. By the mail of the 24th July, from London, which reached this yesterday, I have received a packet containing the printed correspondence between you and myself, together with a short note from you in manuscript, dated the 29th June.* In this printed form I read for the first time your letter to me of the 23rd June, which, if sent originally by the mail of the 24th June, must have perished at sea; but I am unable to account for the packet not having been forwarded to me by the mail of the 8th July. It bears the London post-mark of the 20th July; and I trouble you with this explanation, to obviate any supposition on your part that I have unnecessarily delayed to notice your communication.

2. In my letter to you of the 4th May, I complained, as you rightly state, that myself and others (but

* The "short note" here referred to is the last of the above interjected communications.

chiefly myself) are injuriously affected by a statement reported to me as having been made, in a recently printed Memoir of your public services. But I did more than that: I pointed out to you in precise terms the errors of the passage extracted from the Memoir, which I characterised as false; and I called upon you to disavow the statement which transfers to you and to your name, the credit (if credit there be) belonging to another.

3. In reply, you inform me, that the passage in question "is, and professes to be, an extract from the work "of your personal friend, Dr. Kennedy, published in "1840." Why you designate Dr. Kennedy as my "personal friend, and the friend of Sir H. Pottinger," I am at a loss to conceive. *My* personal friend he is not, and never was; we exchanged visits in society in Bombay, but on the terms only of the most *ordinary* acquaintanceship. This, however, would be a circumstance of little or no moment, had you not yourself given it prominence; and therefore I am careful to undeceive you in this particular.

4. The passage then, you tell me, is a quotation from a work published twelve years ago. Be it so. I do not perceive that this alters the matter between *you* and *me* in the slightest degree. The compiler or author of a memoir relating to another may indeed plead in justification of an inaccuracy that he derived his information from a prior publication, which, having been exposed to criticism for many years, had never been disputed or contradicted, and which, therefore, he had a right to consider true and unquestionable. But you must bear in mind that I referred to you, not as the author, but the subject, of the Memoir. I

knew that the author was your intimate friend; one who has been constantly by your side for years past; and I considered I could hardly be wrong in concluding that he had derived the materials for his work from yourself. I knew, moreover, that you had presented the volume with your own hands to your friends,* and consequently I might, not unreasonably, have deemed your identification with the Memoir complete. Still I was so reluctant to believe that such a statement as was reported to me had emanated from you, that I clung to the hope of its having escaped your notice; and I addressed myself to you, and not to Dr. Ogilvie, in the confident expectation that you would promptly disavow it. I am sorry that in this I have been disappointed. You defend the passage, because it has been previously published by others, and has remained hitherto uncontradicted.† But it appears to have escaped you that in this line of defence you altogether overlook the one main point:—is the statement true or is it not? If originally untrue, no amount of iteration and reiteration can give it the force of truth; you must know yourself what the truth is; and therefore be the statement a quotation or original, matters not. I declare it to be incorrect; you do not defend its accuracy, but content

* And to some of Colonel Melvill's friends and relations also.

† Colonel Outram did not defend the passage *on these grounds*. He declared his belief that neither the author nor the quoter of the passage intended it as a reflection on Colonel Melvill, as that officer alleged. And in support of this belief, he adduced the fact that during the twelve years Dr. Kennedy's remarks had been before the world, neither Colonel Melvill nor any of his numerous friends, had either questioned their accuracy, or put on them the construction to which they were now subjected by that officer.

yourself with telling me that it was put forth years ago by one of my personal friends!*

5. It is satisfactory to me to receive your assurance that it never once occurred to you to put on the passage in question the construction of which I consider it alone to be susceptible. But it would have been more satisfactory had you pointed out what other construction it were possible to put upon such a sentence as this:—"Captain Outram laboured at the Cutch "Durbar, to carry points which should neither have "been left to this late hour, nor left to his manage-"ment." Is not this a distinct reflection upon those whose duty it was to "carry points at the Cutch Durbar?" If it be not, then, may I ask, what meaning is there in the words?†

6. Doctor Kennedy's work I may possibly have seen, but most certainly I never read; it was a publication, I believe, of the time, of little mark or consideration; and what may have been the extent of its circulation

---

* Colonel Outram maintained that the passage in question *was* substantially correct.

† To most readers the author's meaning will be sufficiently obvious. He meant to record with censure the very lamentable neglect of military preparation which characterised the first Affghan expedition, and which almost every historian of that expedition has seen fit to condemn. He meant that it was far from creditable to the military authorities not to have secured at an earlier date, and through the usual departmental channels, the boats, bullocks, camels, &c. &c. which were *indispensable* for the movement of the Army, and in quest of which Outram had to be sent to Cutch, *after* our troops had been landed on the swampy banks of the Indus. He *could not* have intended to reflect on Colonel Pottinger or his Assistant, for he could not have been aware of the fact now promulgated by Colonel Melvill (page 35), that to him and his Superior had been, at that early date, assigned the duty of "applying to the service of the force under Sir John Keane, *the resources of Cutch, most liberally placed at our disposal by the Rao.*"

in Bombay or elsewhere, I cannot pretend to say.* Some of my friends may possibly have read the passage I deem obnoxious, and may, without being sensible of any neglect of their duty towards me, have failed to bring it to my notice.† Be this, however, as

* Dr. Kennedy's work, the first narrative of the Affghan war given to the public, excited that general attention which it deserved, alike from the interesting topic of which it treated, from its intrinsic merits, and from the high official position which its author had occupied during the occurences which he described. It was on more than one occasion referred to in Parliament; and it was declared by the late Sir Robert Peel to be the best and most authoritative work on the subject of which it treated. It was extensively and favourably noticed in the English periodicals; and it has often been quoted by writers of eminence on military, medico-military, and topographical subjects; by such men, for example, as Sir G. Ballingall, Henry Marshall, Edwarde Pococke, &c. &c. In India it excited *very much* interest. In Bombay, especially, it was, for long after its appearance, a favorite topic of conversation. It was reviewed in the periodicals, and discussed at the dinner tables of that Presidency. And Colonel Outram was justified in assuming that Colonel Melvill, as a member of Bombay society, and apart from his official position, must have read it, or learned from hearsay most of its contents. Considering that when it appeared, Colonel Melvill was Military Secretary to the Bombay Government, the probability that he had done so (and that he had deemed it his *duty* to do so) was considerably enhanced. And as the work necessarily alluded to transactions in which Colonel Melvill's late Chief (Colonel Pottinger) had taken a part, and to services in which many of his friends had participated, it was all but incredible that Colonel Melvill, a gentleman of literary tastes, should *not* have read the two volume (octavo) narrative of a townsman, who, though now repudiated as a "*friend*," was on speaking and dining terms with him—in a colonial town, not surcharged with authors. Colonel Melvill's declaration that he never read the book is, of course, conclusive as to the fact. But it nowise affects Colonel Outram's argument, that if the passage in the book to which Colonel Melvill takes exception for the first time, when reprinted in 1853, had been regarded by that officer's friends (or enemies) as reflecting on his character, it would have been brought to his notice during the years that have elapsed since 1840.

† What! a passage which Colonel Melvill describes as *obviously* attributing to him "*incompetency for the office he held*," "*and dereliction of the duty he had to perform*,"—"*a false statement—false in fact and false in inference*"—"*a false statement affecting his public character, &c.*"

it may, I solemnly assert that until I saw it as an extract from your Memoir, I was wholly ignorant of any such imputation having been cast upon me. And this being so, I have, I conceive, an undoubted right to call upon you to disavow it, when I find it in a work which, though not written by yourself, you have clearly adopted and made your own.*

7. Of the compilation of your testimonials in 1843, I have no sort of knowledge. Colonel Barnewell and Captain Pontardent were certainly friends of mine; but they had, I presume, no means of information from any other source than yourself;—they naturally accepted what you presented to them as correct; and I regret to find that the production of your recent Memoir is not, as I supposed it was, the first occasion on which you have adopted and given currency to the inaccuracy which, in my Letter of the 4th May, I have brought to your notice.†

* Colonel Outram *had* disavowed on his own part, and on that of the compiler of his Memoir, any idea that imputations against Colonel Melvill were implied, or could reasonably be supposed to be implied in the passage alluded to. And he had done his best to have the possibility of any misunderstanding removed; though he could not consent to (what he considered) Colonel Melvill's erroneous statements going forth uncorrected.

† The "Testimonials" referred to, consisted of certain notices of Colonel Outram's public services, (contained in Government Dispatches and in published works,) which that officer was, at the earnest suggestion of several of his friends, induced to submit to the Court of Directors, when, in 1843, he found himself subjected to the bitter hostility of Lord Ellenborough, and the Napier family. The compilation of these notices was undertaken, *and exclusively conducted*, by Colonel Barnewell and Captain Pontardent; neither of whom consulted Colonel Outram on the subject. Both gentlemen, as Colonel Melvill admits, were his own personal friends. Both, it it may be added, were thoroughly acquainted with contemporary Indian history. And Captain Pontardent, who was present with Sir John Keane's Army, had enjoyed ample opportunities for acquiring a correct knowledge of the events of the campaign.

8. I am glad to observe that there is little difference between the account given in your own diary of your proceedings during your visit to Cutch in December 1838, and that which I detailed in my former Letter.* You have, indeed, given to your mission a somewhat more important character than I ever deemed it to bear; and I must dissent from your assumption that you were instructed "to urge His Highness (the Rao) "to exert himself more effectually than he had hitherto "done in supplying the army with the means of pro-"secuting its onward march."† You must remember your own position at the time—and mine. You were an A.D.C. of Sir J. Keane, bearing no authority with you whatever beyond your Captain's commission.‡

* The difference is considerable.

† Surely Colonel Outram can himself best say what instructions he received from his Chief. These he described (page 39), as being "to explain to Captain Melvill his straitened condition—to entreat him to strain his influence in the Commader-in-Chief's behalf—to deliver a complimentary message to the Prince; and in so doing, to urge His Highness to exert himself more effectually than he had hitherto done, in supplying the army with the means of prosecuting its onward march." And it is difficult to conceive what other objects than those assigned by Outram could have prompted Sir John Keane to demit to Cutch the only officer on his personal staff possessed of Indian experience, in the only vessel at his disposal on which he could rely for maintaining his communications. It is in the last degree unreasonable to suppose that Outram was, under such circumstances, sent to Cutch for any purpose which, in Sir John Keane's opinion, could have been effected by "correspondence" with Captain Melvill. And, as if effectually to demonstrate the untenability of such a surmise, Colonel Melvill, in a later letter, affirms most positively, that *a direct overland communication between the Army and Bhooj was at the time perfectly open and uninterrupted, and often very rapid*;" whereas the route taken by Outram was by sea, and circuitous.

‡ The very question at issue! True, Outram's rank in the Army in December, 1830, was no higher than that of Colonel Pottinger's Assistant. Both were then Captains. But Captain Outram who had, by a combination of Civil and Military achievements, elicited the frequent and hearty commendations of the authorities,

And I take leave to doubt the correctness of the interpretation you put upon your instructions from Sir J. Keane, when you supposed yourself authorised to convey such a message as the above to the Prince you were to visit. Moreover let me remind you that I was not left to learn the nature of your mission from yourself. I received Letters from Sir J. Keane, fully informing me of his requirements and wishes;*—I was in pos-

---

both in this country and in India;—who had been officially pronounced by the Bombay Government as "one of the first military officers under that Presidency;"—who had been held up to the Bombay Army by Sir John Malcolm as a brilliant example of what an officer should be;—who had thrown up a highly prized political appointment that he might join the Affghan expedition; and whose temporary absence from his political duties was felt to involve so "great a loss to the public service," that he was only permitted to join the Army from the Government being "impressed with the high qualifications he possessed for rendering it the most valuable services"—declares that he bore a special commission from His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, to do his utmost to stimulate the Cutch authorities to new and increased exertions, with a view to extricate the British Army from the very serious dilemma in which it was placed,—through want of supplies and carriage, in a hostile, or at all events, an unfriendly country. And it is impossible to doubt that he did so.

* As will hereafter be seen, Colonel Outram assigns reasons for believing that Colonel Melvill's memory must have deceived him greatly in respect of having received *any* letters. But assuming that Colonel Melvill's reminiscences are correct, how, it may be asked, would the receipt of "letters" affect the matter in dispute? The letters were not conveyed by Outram. They must, therefore have been written either *before* or *after* his demission. If *before*—the inevitable conclusion is that Sir John Keane had more faith in the personal presence in Cutch of his energetic A.D.C. than in the unstimulated zeal of Colonel Pottinger's Assistant. And if we must accept, *sine granis*, Colonel Melvill's declaration, that at and prior to the date of Outram's mission, the entire responsibility of applying to the service of Sir John Keane's Army "*the resources of Cutch*, MOST LIBERALLY *placed at our disposal by the Rao*," rested on himself and his Chief, it cannot be a matter of astonishment that the Commander-in-Chief should have had recourse to an Officer on whose zeal he could rely, to stimulate one who, loaded with such responsibilities, and enjoying such facilities for acquitting himself of

session of these, when I advised you to return to Sind; I did not fail to acquaint your Chief with what I had done; and had you acted upon my advice, you would not, I am confident, have found yourself exposed to any charge of failure in duty. I repeat, in plain terms, that from my position in political charge of the province, and the nature of the instructions I held from my superiors, I had full power, had I pleased in the exercise of my discretion, to decline to introduce you to the Rao. And had I done so, I should have stood in no fear of any rebuke from Lord Auckland, to whom, probably, your name and your mission were at the time equally unknown.*

---

them, had hitherto contributed not a single camel to the Army; and whose labours had resulted in nothing more important than the dispatch of five hundred camels which had not yet come to hand. If the letters were written *after* Outram's departure, only their production will satisfy any reasonable man that they were not merely ordinary letters of *courtesy*, announcing Outram's mission, and soliciting Captain Melvill's earnest co-operation. That they *could not*, by any possibility, have been such as Colonel Melvill's expressions would almost seem to imply they were—letters superseding Outram's Mission, and divesting him of the duties which had been assigned to him—is sufficiently obvious from the whole context of the mission, and from the fact that nothing had intermediately occurred to ameliorate that distressed condition of the Army, which had rendered the mission necessary. It would further seem established by the fact, that not the most distant allusion to them, not the most remote hint of their very existence, was made to Outram; notwithstanding that he declined to accept orders or instructions from his brother Captain—that he visited Bhooj contrary to that Officer's recommendations—and that he advocated measures in the Durbar of which Captain Melvill disapproved.

The letters of such an Officer as Sir John Keane, written in the presence of such events as the Affghan War, would have been deemed worthy of preservation by gentlemen less careful of their documentary possessions than Colonel Melvill has the reputation of being. It were well then that they were produced.

* It matters not whether the name of Sir John Keane's messenger had ever been heard of by Lord Auckland, or not. If Lord Keane had reported that the objects of a mission on which he had deputed

9. That I introduced you to the Rao with cordial readiness, is most true; and I will add the cordiality was as unfeigned as was the "welcome" with which you say I received you. As to "mortification," or any feeling akin to it, arising from your mission, it never so much as crossed my mind. I little thought, indeed, that in after years it would be asserted that you had performed for me duties which belonged to my office, and which ought to have been performed by myself; and it is, truly, a source of "mortification" to me that such a fallacy should be published, and that you should hesitate to contradict it.*

---

any messenger had been frustrated, at such a crisis, by the Assistant in charge of the Bhooj Residency, it is probable that not all Captain Melvill's India House influence (enormous as it is supposed to be) would have prevented Lord Auckland from severely rebuking him. That Colonel Outram's mission was unknown to Lord Auckland until after its accomplishment, is *of course* true; for not many hours elapsed between Sir John Keane's resolution to send his Aide-de-camp to Cutch, and the departure of that officer. But Colonel Melvill falls into a very strange error when he expresses his belief that Outram's name, and high professional reputation, were unknown to Lord Auckland. It was in compliance with the personal request of his Lordship, who had watched and applauded Outram's proceedings as Political Agent for the Mahi Kanta, that the Bombay Government were induced to assent to that Officer's request to be permitted, (at the sacrifice of £700 per annum,) to join the Army destined for the invasion of Affghanistan. "In complying with your application,"—thus wrote the Secretary of the day to Outram, —"In complying with your application, Government cannot help feeling the great loss to the public service which your temporary absence from your present important duties in the Mahi Kanta will occasion; but being impressed with the high qualifications which you possess for rendering the most valuable services on an occasion like the present, for which your zeal has now prompted you to offer yourself, the Governor in Council has not thought it right to withhold his acquiescence in your wishes." The Secretary could only add, in an official document, that Outram's zeal should be brought to the notice of the Governor-General. But the Governor privately submitted to him the contents of his Lordship's Letter.

* Colonel Outram had, on no single occasion, hesitated to contradict any "fallacy" affecting Colonel Melvill or any one else. But he

10 The account I have given of the conversation at the palace is necessarily from recollection; no note was made of it at the time; it was a private interview, and what passed was never recorded. I am perfectly satisfied, however, of the thorough accuracy of my recollection; and I do not, to the best of my belief, err in what I have stated relative to "driving the country for Camels." The Rao told us that if the British Government pleased so to direct, he was ready to command his Chiefs to bring all the Camels they possessed into Bhooj, and surrender them for our service. At the same time His Highness explained that there were no large herds of cattle, the personal property of the Chiefs, anywhere but in some of the remote parts of Wagur. I told His Highness at once, we did not desire this; you remarked to this effect, "why not allow His Highness to use his power "as he thinks best."* I passed your observations over

had declined to sanction what he considered the very erroneous statements promulgated by Colonel Melvill. The "duties" performed by Outram in Cutch are patent to the world. And until Colonel Melvill saw fit to declare that the performance of these "duties belonged to *his* office," no one for a moment supposed that *he* was in the most remote degree responsible for the fact, now irrevocably recorded in history, that the resources of Cutch, in boats, bullocks, and camels, were *not* made available with the desired promptitude, for the use of Sir John Keane's Army.

* This description of the procedure of Colonel Outram at the Durbar of the Rao differs slightly from that given by Colonel Melvill in his first Letter (*antea* p. 32), wherein he says:—"In the course of our conversation with His Highness, which did not last above half-an-hour, mention was made of the want of carriage for the Army; and YOU offered one or two suggestions which I put aside, as in my opinion, inexpedient. One of these was to enter into contracts for pack-bullocks with certain Brinjarries; *and another was to use the power of the Rao to force the Wagur Chiefs to surrender for our use all the camels in their possession—to* DRIVE *the country in fact.* Both of these propositions I negatived, for reasons which were afterwards perfectly approved."

purposely, but in the court-yard of the palace, after taking our leave of the Prince, I informed you that there were circumstances in the relations then pending between the Durbar and the Wagur Chiefs, which rendered it highly inexpedient to permit the Rao to use his power in this manner. I may have misapprehended your meaning at the moment, and on reflection you might have seen the matter in the same light as myself, but of the conversation as I have above related it, I am positive in my recollection.*

* Whichever of the two versions given of Colonel Outram's "suggestions" be the correct one, it is evident that the "*mention made*," &c., was made rather more energetically by that officer than the general tenor of Colonel Melvill's Letters would lead the reader to infer; and that the zeal of the A.D.C. was more conspicuous than that of the "Political." It was *not* "large herds of camels, the personal property of the Chiefs," that Outram was sent in quest of, but the greatest possible aggregate attainable of beasts and boats of burden, whether obtained in units, tens, or hundreds, and whether the personal property of the Chiefs, or of humbler individuals. And even had it been otherwise, it is difficult to conceive the existence of any "*relations*" between a petty Oriental "Durbar," like that of Bhooj, and a parcel of wretched "Wagur Chiefs," which could possibly render it "*highly inexpedient*" (!) to "PERMIT" the former to exercise its influence in behalf of the Army; in behalf of an Army which had been set in motion by the Governor-General of British India, under explicit orders from Her Britannic Majesty's Ministers, and from high considerations of European policy; and which, through mismanagement or miscalculations in *some* quarter, had been landed on an unhealthy and hostile shore, destitute of the means of performing the politico-military duties assigned to it. No history, therefore, of the Affghan War can henceforth be deemed complete which does not fully expound, and carefully investigate, the cogency of the "*relations*" which were regarded by Sir H. Pottinger and his Assistant (one, both, or either) as involving considerations paramount in importance to the necessities of the stranded Army. For to these "relations," it is now obvious, are due most, if not all, those embarrassments—embarrassments frequently on the verge of lapsing into miscarriage of the expedition—experienced by Sir John Keane when, departing from the banks of the Indus, he could no longer avail himself of the Mootnee and fleet of boats which Outram's zeal and energy had provided for him.

11. You state that you "addressed strong appeals to "His Highness, in the name of the Commander-in-Chief,

---

Hitherto the mishaps of the Campaign have been attributed to negligence and want of foresight in Bombay, and at army head quarters, as well as to a disinclination on the part of the Rao of Cutch to assist us in coercing his Scindian neighbours. And to his belief in that disinclination Col. Outram very pointedly refers in his first Letter, (p. 40) where he says—"With a thoroughly hearty and cordial desire on the part of the Rao to aid us, no such measure (as '*driving*' the country) would have been necessary; the Chiefs would have hired out their camels to us without force." But Col. Melvill tells a very different story. He assures us that "*the resources of Cutch were* MOST LIBERALLY *placed at our disposal by the Rao.*" He declares that to Colonel Pottinger and himself, *and to them exclusively*, was confided the duty of applying these resources to the service of Sir J. Keane's Army. And the context of the passage in which he propounds these statements distinctly proves that he refers to periods antecedent to, and contemporary with, as well as posterior to the date of Outram's mission. In other words, he explicitly renders Col. Pottinger and himself responsible for the historical fact that the resources of Cutch (most liberally placed at their disposal) were NOT applied to the service of Sir John Keane's Army at a proper time, or in sufficient amount And yet, while assuming this responsibility, he urges, in depreciation of Outram's services, that "*no precautions suitable to the times, or practicable, were omitted*" by Col. Pottinger or himself; and that the Colonel's instructions were "*comprehensive, clear, and farreaching!*" Let us see.

The "camels and boats promised to be in readiness against the arrival of the Army"—in reliance on which Sir John Keane disembarked his troops, and the absence of which placed the Army in a position at once ridiculous, mischievous, and perilous—had been promised by the Ameers of Hydrabad, through Colonel Pottinger, then officiating as Envoy at their Court. And if the sagacity of that officer had been so "*comprehensive, clear, and farreaching*" as Colonel Melvill avers, and if he was anxious that no delays should be incurred by the military chief, how came it that, entertaining the opinions he *then* entertained of the Ameers, he did not *anticipate* a reluctance on the part of these Princes to implement their promises, and provide against the contingency by drawing to a greater extent than five-hundred camels on the copious resources of Cutch, which had been so liberally placed at his disposal, and for the application of which to the service of Sir John Keane's Army he was responsible? Or—to take lower ground—how was it that his "*comprehensive, clear, and farreaching*" views were unequal to the task of comprehending the actual necessities of the case, when

"for speedy and extensive aid." I can only say that if you did address such an appeal, most certainly I was

---

General Wiltshire arrived at the mouth of the Indus on the 26th of November—or when Sir John Keane arrived on the 27th—or even when, on the 28th, his own Assistant, Captain Eastwick, was sent to report in Camp that "*no preparations whatever had been made by the Ameers for transporting the troops or provisioning them*"—aye, or at any date prior to the 2nd of December, when Outram went on shore at Mandavie? Yet though, at that time, Colonel Melvill *very positively* asserts that the communications between Scinde and Bhooj were "perfectly open and uninterrupted, and often very rapid," it does not appear that *any* energetic steps had been taken to apply "the resources of Cutch" in such a manner as to enable the Army to move promptly up the Indus—*the only measure likely to bring the Ameers to terms.* Would it have been neither "*suitable to the times nor practicable*," to have *at once* ordered round to the mouth of the Indus the "Mootnee," the fleets of boats, the pack-bullocks (aye, and even the "sheep and forage,") of which the Army was so grievously in need, and which it was left to Outram to secure? Were Captain Melvill's objections to pack-bullocks "*suitable to a time*," when the Army was at a dead stand still for want of the means of moving its baggage, and when the "*relations*" of a parcel of raggamuffin Wagur Chiefs were regarded by that Officer as justifying him in *not* applying to the service of the Army, without stint, the resources of a province "*most liberally placed at his disposal*" *for that purpose?* WHY—it may be asked—was Captain Melvill, who so scantily applied these liberally proffered resources to the service of the Army, so excessively anxious to hurry out of Cutch the special messenger of its destitute and indignant Commander-in-Chief? WHY was he so solicitous that Outram should "*return to Scinde without delay?*" WHY did he write that all to be done in Cutch "*had been already done, or was in progress;*" although all that *had* been done was to send the five hundred camels (despatched before the Army left Bombay, and still in detention); and although the "Mootnee" and the boats were, and had been, lying in the harbour of Mandavie, *available but unemployed?*

These (*and many other*) questions are irresistibly suggested by the present correspondence. They are questions of which no one would have dreamt, but for the extraordinary statements hazarded, the admissions made, the claims asserted, and the responsibilities assumed by Colonel Melvill, in extensively circulated documents, the avowed object of which has been to convict a brother Officer of a paltry attempt to arrogate the praise due to another in a matter intrinsically trivial. They are, however, questions which Colonel Melvill's Letters *compel* the friends of the assailed individual to promulgate. They are questions on which every student of History

unconscious of it, and I will venture to add the Rao was equally so.* It is remarkable that in your own Diary, no mention is made of anything but "remembrances and good wishes," and of "cordial messages "in reply;" and this agrees exactly with my memory.†

has an absolute and indefeasible right to speculate. And they are questions for which solutions *shall* be found. The solution most agreeable to Colonel Melvill, and that which the Editor believes to be the correct one, rests on the hypothesis that the gallant Colonel, in the fervour of controversy, and under the irritation caused by an imaginary affront, made many unadvised statements, without pausing to determine with sufficient care whether they were the promptings of memory, or merely the suggestions of an active and temporarily excited imagination. The Editor believes the fact to have been, that in organizing the expedition, the Bombay Government, Sir J. Keane, and Colonel Pottinger, relied too much on their ability to coerce the Ameers, by diplomacy and military demonstration, into the fulfilment of even more than their promises; that notwithstanding the Ameer's conduct, Colonel Pottinger continued to rely on his suasive abilities, and was anxious to delay the application of force as long as possible; that Sir John Keane, viewing the question as a soldier—*not* as a diplomatist—and indignant at the position in which he was placed, sent Outram to Cutch, with instructions such as that Officer has described; that Outram executed his commission with his usual zeal and success; and that Captain Melvill, the friend and regular correspondent of Colonel Pottinger, aware of his feelings, hopes, and expectations, and sympathising with his views, did *not* conceive it to be his duty, either to the state or to humanity, to hurry on military movements, and therefore regretted the advent of Sir John Keane's eagerly zealous messenger. Admit these propositions, and the whole becomes intelligible. Disallow them—insist on the accuracy of Colonel Melvill's hastily rendered statements—and the conclusion becomes inevitable, that Dr. Kennedy's censures, though inapplicable to those on whom they have hitherto been supposed to rest, were merited by others.

* Unless appeals *had* been made, and those too of an energetic nature, why should the Rao, who had already *placed the resources of the country* MOST LIBERALLY *at our disposal*" have offered, "*if Government pleased so to direct*," to command his Chiefs to bring all their camels to Bhooj—"*to drive the country, in fact?*"

† Only the moment before penning this line, Colonel Melvill had most effectually refuted the assertion it contains, and the argument it is intended to convey. He had very satisfactorily shown that *much more* than "remembrances and good wishes" were uttered

12. I most readily admit that I may have erred in thinking that I ever pointed out to you the inaccuracy of the allusion made in your "Rough Notes," to *arrangements* made with me in Cutch. You may possibly remember that after you first sent me the volume I was for sometime silent; when you wrote to me again saying that you feared I looked upon it only as an "idle brag."* I then gave you my opinion in a general form, and possibly omitted from a feeling of delicacy to refer to that part which concerned myself. Nevertheless, whether previously noticed or not, it is a mistake to say you *arranged* with me for anything;

---

in the Durbar; that Outram *had* discussed topics to which (in conformity with his invariable practice when alluding to the official interviews he held with high or important personages) he made no allusion in the very modest and meagre "Diary" published by him at the request of his friends. If the entry in the Diary is to be used for the purpose of "*proving a negative*," it must be held valid to establish that Colonel Melvill's own account is essentially inaccurate; that "mention" was *not* made of the helpless state of the Army; that Outram made *no* suggestions; and that Colonel Melvill did *not* "negative" the conditional offer of the Rao to provide carriage for the distressed troops, as he in a measure prides himself on having done. It is simply ridiculous to suppose that Outram, the only Officer on the personal staff possessed of Indian experience, would have been detached to Cutch in the only vessel then at the mouth of the Indus, on which reliance could be placed for maintaining communications, simply to convey complimentary messages to a demi-barbarous Prince, from a Commander-in-Chief not remarkable, by any means, for his Native sympathies, and greatly enraged at his inability to move for want of means of transport. And no one who knows Colonel Outram's character and antecedents, would have believed that, charged with more important functions, he failed in their performance; even had Colonel Melvill not himself afforded a satisfactory, though unintentional, refutation of his own hastily rendered allegations.

* An expression very likely to occur in the course of a confidential correspondence; but one which by no means implies that the person using it was conscious of having overstepped the strict limits of accuracy.

if by *arrangement* you mean that anything was done by means of your exertions, your influence, or your advice. Probably I told you what had been done, and what was to be done; and if this be sufficient to warrant the words "arranged with," I am content to let them pass.*

13. I have said that there is very little difference between us, as to the occurrences of the short period you passed in Cutch. But if you decline to admit my version of those occurrences, I am satisfied to take your own, as recorded in your "Rough Notes." You have quoted them yourself in your Letter to me of 23rd June, and I ask, is there a word in those entries which can be held to bear out the inflated narrative of your expedition quoted in the commencement of my Letter to you of the 4th May? Are your conversations with me and your interview with the Rao to reciprocate remembrances and good wishes between the Prince and Sir J. Keane, to be viewed as "labouring to carry points at the Cutch Durbar?" And did the obtaining a few boats, and boatloads of forage, (procured, by-the-bye, by Captain Ward my assistant, and not by yourself personally,) constitute that effect surpassing all expectation, which the passage in your Memoir declares to have been the result of your labours?†

* Colonel Outram's friends decline to put this interpretation on the "arrangements" made by him at Bhooj. Their reasons will be sufficiently apparent to the reader of this correspondence.

† What Outram's labours at the Cutch Durbar really were, each reader must determine for himself, from the internal evidences afforded by this correspondence. But Colonel Melvill cannot deny that he landed at Mandavie on the 2nd December; that he lost no time in calling on Captain Ward (Colonel Pottinger's Assistant at that port) to furnish, without delay, certain of those supplies of which the Army stood so terribly in need; that on the evening

14. But I will bring the point of the discussion between us, yet closer home. Observe that I am dealing solely with Cutch, and the carriage obtained from that Province. I never meant it to be understood that Sir J. Keane's force moved with the Cutch Camels alone. But I asserted, and you admit it, that it was the arrival of the Cutch Camels which enabled the force to break ground from its encampment at the mouth of the Hujamsee. I know well that a thousand or twelve hundred Camels had been previously collected by

---

of the 3rd, no less than twenty-two boats, with forage and sheep, were transmitted; that on the 4th, Outram engaged, or caused to be engaged, additional boats and pack-bullocks for the use of the Army; that on the same day he took on himself the responsibility of demanding the large Indus Flat "Mootnee," which afterwards sufficed to carry no inconsiderable portion of Sir John Keane's Artillery and Ammunition; and that, having accomplished these objects of his mission, he set sail the same evening. Colonel Melvill also admits that, between his landing at Mandavie on the 2nd December, and his departure on the 4th, Outram had ridden to and from Bhooj, (a distance of about eighty miles,) *and conversed with the Rao, respecting the wants of the Army.* Nay, he prides himself in having "*negatived*" certain measures in behalf of the Army, urged by Outram in Durbar. He concedes that the following entry in Outram's Diary, though submitted to himself in 1841, had never been called in question, prior to May, 1853:—

"Arranged with Captain Melvill, Assistant Resident in charge, "for the supply of five-hundred *additional* camels, five-hundred "having already been sent off, *viâ* Luckput, *and four-hundred pack-bullocks, to be shipped at Mandavie.*"

And when it is borne in mind, that, in addition to the pack-bullocks, the boats, and the River Flat "Mootnee," which Outram secured at Mandavie, he procured, on his way back to Head Quarters, not eight-hundred, as Dr. Kennedy supposed, but *upwards* of *twelve* hundred camels, which Nao Mull had failed to persuade their owners to bring to the British Camp, it must be conceded that the Author of the "*Narrative of the Campaign of the Army of the Indus,*" indulged in no exaggeration when he wrote, that to Outram "chiefly, if not entirely," was to be attributed the release of the Army from its awkward position; and that, he "*surpassed expectation in what he was able to effect.*"

Nao Mull, under Sir Henry Pottinger's orders, in Lower Sind; but as no more were obtainable there, these would have been comparatively useless without the Cutch detachment. This is the sense in which Col. Macdonald said the five hundred Camels sent by me from Cutch enabled the Army to advance; and this is the groundwork of Kaye's statement that "a "supply of carriage from Cutch came opportunely to "release Sir J. Keane."*

* The five hundred camels, spoken of by Colonel Melvill, had been despatched by him, according to his own account, "long before Sir J. Keane left Bombay,"—i. e. long before 22nd November. They had been detained by Shere Mahomed on the Scinde frontier; and they did not reach the Army until eighteen days after Outram had been despatched to Cutch, nor until eight days after his return to Head Quarters. It was in perfect knowledge of their whereabouts that Sir John Keane dispatched Outram. And though it may be, and probably is the case, that without these five hundred, the Army could not have advanced, it is equally obvious, in the first place, that it was not in search of these five hundred animals that Outram was despatched to Cutch; and secondly, that but for the "Mootnee," the fleet of boats, and the pack bullocks, procured by Outram—*these camels would have been of no use.* And even the "Mootnee," the bullocks, and the flotilla of boats, would have been of little avail had not Outram, by his personal exertions, secured the "thousand or twelve-hundred camels," for which Nao Mull was in treaty, but which the camel-men, influenced by emissaries from Hydrabad, were about to carry off, when Sir John Keane's Aide-de-camp appeared amongst them, and by his pledges and promises, induced them to hold to their engagements. The five hundred camels, sent from Cutch in November, and detained for weeks at the Scinde frontier, could *hardly* have been the groundwork of Mr Kaye's statement that a supply of carriage from Cutch came opportunely to release Sir John Keane. It is much more likely that, knowing of Outram's mission, he assumed all the additional "carriage" secured by that officer to have consisted of camels, and all the camels secured to have been obtained from Cutch. But even if it were otherwise, it appears somewhat hard to hold Colonel Outram responsible for the writings of an author, with whom, at the date of these writings, he had not the honor to be acquainted; the more especially as Outram had handsomely *volunteered* to explain to Mr Kaye the mistake into which he had fallen. The extent of that mistake has been indicated in the preceding note.

15. Now then, as those Camels from Cutch were dispatched by me, long before you ever set foot in the Province,—as they were, by your own admission, within a few marches of Sir J. Keane when you were detached on your mission, to use your own words, "to Cutch to procure assistance in land and water "carriage," I ask you, how you possibly can consider Kaye's direct assertion that this very "supply of carriage "*from Cutch*" was "obtained by the energetic exer- "tions of Captain Outram," merely an ambiguous expression liable to some misconception, and requiring partial correction? To give to this passage any pretension to accuracy, it must be stated, not merely as you propose apparently, that all the contributions to the stock of carriage which were derived from Cutch, were not due to your exertions; but that, with the exception possibly of a few boats from Mandavie, *none* were due to you.* And the only light in which I can agree that your mission to Bhooj should be regarded, is that with whatever zeal you may have been actuated, and with whatever ardour you may have devoted your-

* It is odd to observe how systematically Colonel Melvill ignores the fact, that in the passage which has given rise to the present controversy Dr. Kennedy described the Army as having been detained "from the want of camels and *boats*, which had been promised to be ready against our arrival;" and that Outram in his Diary explicitly states he was sent to Cutch to "procure assistance in land and *water* carriage." But to use the expression "*possibly a few boats*, in reference to the "water carriage" obtained from Cutch, is odder still. And it was hardly to be expected from a gentleman who had from 1841 until 1853 silently acquiesced in the entries in Outram's modestly-written "Rough Notes," which record, that on the 3rd of December he had caused a fleet of twenty-two boats to be dispatched; that on the 4th he secured, on his own responsibility, the "Mootnee," and the boats necessary for towing it to the Hujamry; and that on the same day he obtained the promise of another fleet of boats adequate for the conveyance of the pack-bullocks promised him by Colonel Melvill.

self to the public service of the time, the result was —nothing. Possibly you may, at Mandavie, have suggested to Captain Ward the despatch of some Pack Bullocks, by water. I was at the moment in correspondence with Sir Henry Pottinger, on the subject, and I afterwards received instructions, quite in accordance with my own opinion, not to engage this description of carriage. But with this possible and trivial exception, I do not hesitate to say, that neither then nor at any subequent time was any carriage whatever procured by your exertions in Cutch; and not a Camel reached Sir J. Keane's force that would not have reached it, and at precisely the same period, had you never entered the Province at all.*

16. You say that my communication to you was evidently written under strong, and you trust evanescent feelings: strong they were, and I expressed myself strongly; evanescent they would have been, had you, as I conceive I had a right to expect, done me the justice I required at your hands. That justice you have not yet rendered, and my feelings continue unchanged. I am not conscious of having written under any misconception whatsoever; and as to withdrawing

* Whatever may have been the individual views or notions of Col. Pottinger and Capt. Melvill on the subject, there is no doubt that *any* animal capable of carrying a few pounds of baggage was, at that moment, of inestimable value to the Army, deprived as it was of the "large herds" of camels most liberally placed at Captain Melvill's disposal, in consequence of the important '*relations*' of the Wagur Chiefs. It is moreover obvious that when Outram took his leave of Captain Melvill he understood that officer to have PROMISED him (though, as it now appears, contrary to "his own opinions," and perhaps never transmitted,) "*four hundred pack-bullocks, to be sent by Mandavie, and five hundred camels,*" *in addition to those which had already been sent, and which were in detention on the Scindian frontier, when he was deputed to Cutch by the Commander-in-Chief.*

my Letter, there is nothing I more ardently desire than its general and extensive circulation, I adhere to every word of it; and deeply as I regret, in unison with yourself, that such a correspondence as this should have arisen between us, I do not for a moment shrink from a controversy brought on by no act of mine, and in which I feel that I have right and truth on my side.

17. I have already taken measures to let those Indian friends to whom I submitted copies of my Letter to you of the 4th May, peruse your reply; and they will also see this my rejoinder. In England, the only person, beyond the immediate circle of my own family and connections, to whom I forwarded my former Letter, was Colonel Moore.* I refrained from a wider circulation, sincerely desirous of affording you the opportunity of promptly and fully correcting the mis-statements of which I had reason to complain, and had frankly pointed out.

18. But as you have not done this, I shall probably print, before I leave India, all the correspondence that has passed between us, on this subject; and I annex to this Letter copies of two communications which I have received from Sir Henry Pottinger and Colonel Davidson, and which I have the free permission of the writers to attach. I have referred to Sir Henry Pottinger and to Colonel Davidson (the Commissariat officer with Sir J. Keane's force throughout the campaign), as the only persons, so far as I am aware, beyond ourselves, cognizant of the facts in discussion,

* How was Colonel Outram to ascertain the names and addresses of Colonel Melvill's multitudinous "family and connections?" His brothers had denied ever having seen the letter. His brother-in-law, Colonel Ovans, had evaded the reference made to him.

and whose testimony can be of any value on one side or the other.

19. Before I conclude, it is proper I should add that the only *animus* on the part of the friend who sent me the Extract from the Memoir, was a zeal for my character, and an honest desire that the truth should be known. I think, upon reflection, you will agree that the passage being a quotation makes no real difference in the case, and consequently that it could not have been by any *misrepresentation*, intentional or unintentional, that I was induced to address you in the terms of my first letter.*

20. Finally, I may state, that up to this hour I have not seen the Memoir; and the passage cited in my letter to you, is the only passage I have yet read.

21. I have been compelled to write very hurriedly, from shortness of time, and the pressure of business of various kinds; but I believe I have expressed all I wished, and I hope with sufficient clearness to be intelligible.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

P. M. MELVILL.

P.S. I have omitted to state that, so far as I can learn, no copy of your Memoir has been received at this Presidency.

---

* Colonel Outram, and his friends, conceive that they have *good* reason to complain of the correspondent who, in sending Colonel Melvill an "EXTRACT" from the "Memoir of Colonel Outram's Services," had *concealed* from him first, that the passage in question was—*and professed to be*—an excerpt from a book long before the public, the author of which was far better known to Colonel Melvill than the Compiler of the "Memoir;" and secondly, that the writer of the "Memoir" had most fully explained the care he had taken to render Colonel Outram, morally as well as technically, irresponsible for its contents. *Only* on the supposition that these facts *were*

MADRAS, *August* 21*st*, 1853.

MY DEAR MELVILL,

I have had the pleasure to receive your letters of the 9th and 12th instant. In the first you explain the annoying position in which you found yourself by the non-receipt—owing to the loss of the Bombay Mail of the 24th June—of the reply which Colonel Outram is supposed to have forwarded by that Mail to your letter to him of the 4th May last, touching certain mis-statements that had been published in a Memoir of the Colonel's services, and which mis-statements not only assign to him much credit and commendation for his asserted exertions in connection with carriage furnished from Cutch to Sir J. Keane's force in its advance through Sind in 1838, but reflect seriously on your zeal and public character, by charging you (and others) with great neglect and supineness. In your second letter—that of the 12th instant—you enquire whether I have any objection to your citing so much of my *private* letter to you of the 26th of last month as contains my opinion of your letter of the 4th May to Colonel Outram. I did not keep a copy of my letter to you, and therefore

---

concealed from Colonel Melvill, can the expressions used by Colonel Melvill in his Letter of the 4th of May, 1853, be defended; that they *were* concealed from Colonel Melvill is very distinctly *implied* in his letter. And that this concealment was *intentional* the circumstances of the case would seem to indicate. If not intentional it was certainly one of the most *remarkable* of accidents. But this is a question the settlement of which may be left to Colonel Melvill and the correspondent by whose "*zeal*" and "*honest desire that the truth should be known*"—he was unfortunately induced to attack Colonel Outram in 1853, for words written, printed, and published in 1840, by a distinguished public functionary moving in the same circle of society with himself, and with whom he necessarily had frequent official intercourse.

I cannot recall the exact words I used in it on the above subject; but I know that I repudiated entirely the pretensions that had been advanced in the Memoir on behalf of Colonel Outram; and I again advisedly here repeat that denial in the most unqualified manner, and further declare, from my immediate personal knowledge of passing events at that time, that all that is stated in your letter to Colonel Outram, with regard to the carriage from Cutch, is minutely correct. I need therefore hardly add that you have my free permission either to make use of any part of my *private* letter that you may think fit, or to quote this perhaps more formal enunciation of my opinion.

I have thus answered the *chief point* in your letter; but before I lay down my pen, it is necessary that I should tell you, in reply to one of your queries, that it is only now that I have learned for the first time, that the mis-statements which have led to this correspondence were originally inserted in a work by Dr. Kennedy, formerly of the Bombay Medical Establishment. That book I have not, to the best of my recollection, ever seen; but I understood, some time after it appeared, that it had been made a vehicle of assertions tending to the disparagement of myself and some of the officers who served with me in Sind. I, however, neither had time, nor did I conceive it worth my condescending to take steps to contradict them; their fullest refutation, I may observe, is on the official records of the then Residency in Sind; and accordingly, the only notice I took of them was from that hour to cease to acknowledge Dr. K., with whom I had previously been on terms of intimacy, as an acquaintance.

You will therefore readily comprehend that I have

not been the least surprised that the authorship of the mis-statements that have induced you to stand forward should have been traced to him; but, at the same time, I quite concur with you in thinking that that is no apology for allowing them to be made use of, in the way they have been. Believe me, to remain always,

Yours most sincerely,

(Signed) HENRY POTTINGER.*

BOMBAY, 5th *May*, 1853.

MY DEAR MELVILL,

I am very much obliged indeed to you for sending me, for perusal, your letter to Outram. I know that what you have stated is strictly correct, as all the batches of Camels that came from Cutch were accom-

* In estimating the value of Sir H. Pottinger's remarks, it must be borne in mind, that he was then only in possession of the views promulgated by Colonel Melvill in his letter of the 4th of May; that he had not seen Col. Outram's reply; and that he believed the passage in question was *intended* to impute to himself and Colonel Melvill "incompetency for the offices they filled, and a gross dereliction of the duty they had to perform." That all Colonel Melvill's statements were "minutely correct," is, simply, an egregiously erroneous statement, as the reader has already seen. For Sir H. Pottinger to take on himself to vouch for what Colonel Outram did, or did not, do in Cutch, while he himself was busily and not pleasantly occupied at Hydrabad, was an inadvertence into which, it is to be assumed, he could only have been betrayed in an angry and unguarded moment. Sir Henry's letter would, indeed, almost seem to imply that "*the assertions to his disparagement*" in Dr. Kennedy's book were contained in the passage to which Colonel Melvill had taken exception. This, however, is not the case; and it could not, therefore, have been *meant* by Sir Henry. The "*assertions*" which excited his ire pertained to very different matters—to the selection of Tatta as a military port—a melancholy mistake, which led to the disorganization of a fine regiment, by sickness and death.

panied with detailed statements under your signature of the sums of money to be paid to the respective Jemadars with the animals, and what sums were to be paid on their account in Cutch. Sir Henry Pottinger could tell you that it was through his influence with Nao Mull at Kurrachee that Sir J. Keane's Force got about 1,200 or 1,300 Camels in Lower Sind. Outram's presence at Kurrachee may have hastened Nao Mull's movements, but beyond this, I am not aware that Outram got any Camels for Lord Keane's force in Lower Sind. I have always considered Outram and his friends to have behaved very oddly in claiming credit for procuring Camels, which solely belonged to Sir Henry Pottinger, to you, and to Eastwick.*

Ever yours,

Very sincerely,

(Signed) D. DAVIDSON.

* It is somewhat amusing to find Colonel Melvill's account of what was said and not said, done and not done, by Outram in Cutch, endorsed as "*strictly correct*" by a gentleman who was at that time in Scinde, and amply occupied with the affairs of a Commissariat, against which curses loud and deep were uttered throughout the Campaign! And the data on which the endorsation is founded, are certainly odd ones to occur to a Bombay Commissary. As a matter of course, it was *not* Outram's duty to attend to the executive details of hiring camels. *That* was a duty which devolved on the local officers, or their subordinates, under whose signature the conditions of hiring would, *in conformity with official routine*, be guaranteed. The boatmen and the bullock owners engaged at Mandavie doubtless obtained credentials from Captain Ward, just as the Cutch camel-men received theirs from Colonel (then Captain) Melvill. But that fact by no means tends to derogate from the value of Outram's mission. And Colonel Davidson, by assuming that Outram only "*hastened the movements*" of the camel-men with whom Nao Mull was in treaty, simply proves that *his* information and recollections are not to be altogether relied on, in questions pertaining to Sir John Keane's transit of Lower Scinde.

CALCUTTA, 24*th September*, 1853.

MY DEAR MELVILL,

1. Your letter, dated 27th ultimo, reached me on the 14th instant.

2. Mine of the 23rd of June, was entrusted to your brother James, either that evening or next morning, I forget which; but certainly in time for the Mail of the 24th, by which he assured me it would be forwarded with the Government packet. As you have not received it, I conclude it must have been in the Mail which was lost at sea.

3. Surely you must be mistaken in thinking the post-mark of my second communication (forwarding a printed copy of the previous one) represented the 20*th July*. The date of its receipt would—had you reflected a moment—have shown you were mistaken; assuming, as I do, that you must have received it by the early Mail in August, for I entrusted it to my Agents in ample time for the Southampton Mail of the 4th July, (with which I myself left), and they are not likely to have neglected it.* As you do not say that you did *not* receive my letter on the *Sixth* of August, when that Mail arrived in Bombay I observe—I may reasonably assume that you did so, from the evidence afforded by Sir Henry Pottinger's letter (appended to your present communication) in reply to yours of the *Eighth* and Twelfth of August. Sir Henry therein says, that he had *only then* " for the first time learned that the

* Colonel Melvill did not, as he afterwards assures Col. Outram, receive the Letter till the 25th of August. Its detention is mysterious.

"mis-statements which have led to this correspondence, "were originally inserted in a work by Doctor Ken- "nedy, &c." Now, as my printed letter conveyed the information to you, that the passage which "led to this correspondence" was an extract from "Kennedy," I conclude that *that* letter was then in your possession.*

4. Considering, as I do, my letter of the 23rd June sufficiently explicit upon every point, I might well have declined further correspondence on a subject which had already occupied more of my time than I deem it to deserve; the more especially as the tone of your present communication—like that of its predecessor—is much calculated to give offence, to any one less inclined than myself to make allowance for the excited feelings under which you continue to write. And I would fain have spared our mutual friends who have to wade through this weary Correspondence, the additional burden of my present rejoinder. But there is much in your letter now before me, which—unrefuted—would greatly mislead the reader; I am reluctantly driven, therefore, to the disagreeable task of further reply.

5. I shall not unnecessarily swell this already too extended Correspondence, by following *seriatim* every paragraph of your long letter—though there is scarcely one to which I have not to make objection—and will confine myself to merely noticing, as briefly as I can, the more prominent points requiring comment.

6. In your 5th paragraph, you are pleased to say, in reference to the passage from Kennedy's work of which you complain—"you do not defend its

* Colonel Melvill afterwards explains that he derived the information from other sources.

"accuracy, but content yourself with telling me that "it was put forth years ago by one of my personal "friends."

7. This is incorrect. Though I did not defend the passage on the construction you have chosen to put upon it, I *did* defend it, as not bearing that construction; and as not having been considered by others, at the time, to reflect on Sir H. Pottinger and yourself. And I assured you that "it never once occurred to me "to put on the passage the construction of which alone "you say it is susceptible."

8. With reference to this assurance, you next observe, "But it would have been more satisfactory had you "pointed out what other construction it were possible "to put upon such a sentence as this—'Captain "'Outram laboured at the Cutch Durbar, to carry "'points which should neither have been left to this "'late hour, nor left to his management.'"

9. Thus pressed, I shall no longer scruple to "point out" what you are so desirous to know, though very reluctant to abandon the reserve I had heretofore maintained on this point. For, I would rather have abstained myself from so far reflecting on the authorities concerned, as is involved in my stating what was the impression in the Army at the time: and to give expression to which I then believed, and still believe, Dr. Kennedy intended in this passage.

10. The general feeling throughout the Army, when, on landing at Vikkur, it was seen that no means of transport whatever had been provided, was, that the Government, and the Commander-in-Chief as a member of Government, had strangely neglected their duty in thus placing troops in a position whence they could neither advance nor retire—in a country ex-

pected to prove hostile—unprovided even with the means of moving an Advance Guard. It was on finding himself in this position, and seeing little prospect of relief, that Sir John Keane suddenly resolved on despatching me to Cutch, with the objects stated in my former letter—viz.: "To explain to you his "straitened condition; to entreat you to strain your "influence to the utmost in his behalf; to deliver "complimentary messages to the Prince, * *.* and "to urge His Highness to exert himself," &c. In this there was no reflection on Sir Henry Pottinger—who could do nothing while the Ameers maintained a hostile attitude; nor on yourself, whose hands Sir John fancied he might strengthen by personal application to the Rao, through his Aide-de-Camp. The Commander-in-Chief may have been mistaken in regarding his authority as in the least degree necessary to your support, or to stimulate the Rao to greater exertion; but, that he did so regard it, is shown by the fact of his deputing, at such a time, the only officer on his personal staff possessing Indian experience, and detaching the only vessel then at the mouth of the river on which he could depend to maintain his communications. That such a step should be necessary "at this late hour," was the fault of the Government and his own Chief—the superiors of either Sir Henry Pottinger or yourself—on whom Dr. Kennedy was supposed to reflect in the passage referred to. On more attentively considering that passage than I had done before you raised the question regarding it—for, deeming the matter of little importance, and thinking of no other application than that I have now given, I certainly never critically scanned it I must admit that it is also liable to be

understood, (by any one *pre-disposed* so to regard it,) in the light which you put upon it. But I repeat what I said in my former letter, that "it never once "occurred to me to put on it that construction."

11. In your 8th paragraph you "dissent from my "assumption" that I was instructed "to urge His High- "ness (the Rao) to exert himself more effectually "than he had hitherto done." And you state, that I have "given to my mission a more important cha- "racter than you ever deemed it to bear;" reminding me that my position at the time was but that "of an Aide-de-Camp of Sir John Keane, bearing "no authority with me whatever but that of my "Captain's commission." You "take leave to doubt "the correctness of the interpretation I put upon "my instructions from Sir John Keane;" and you "remind" me, moreover, that you "were not left to "learn the nature of my mission from myself"—that you "received letters from Sir John Keane, informing "you of his requirements and wishes"—and that you were "in *possession of these when you advised me to return to Sinde.*"

12. I am little likely to have forgotten with what view I was deputed on my first Mission, and with what instructions I was entrusted on the first occasion of my Chief placing trust in me. And I solemnly declare, that, in substance and effect, they were what I have stated. If you are in possession of letters which informed you of the nature and objects of my mission, why not produce them, and thus settle the point at once? Until they *are* produced, not only must I "take leave to doubt the interpretation you "have put upon" your letters, but, also, to demonstrate

the impossibility that *any* such letters *could* have been "in your possession when you advised me to "return to Sinde."

13. In a moment of irritation at the vexatious delays and disappointments to which he was exposed, Sir John Keane suddenly resolved on despatching me to Cutch; and, to the best of my recollection, not two hours had elapsed after he had come to this determination, when I departed. Now, as I myself did not convey to you the letters you refer to; as the communication by land, which, if open at all, would have taken at least double the time occupied by my sea voyage, was at that time interrupted by Shere Mahomed, then avowedly hostile to the British; and as the only other means of communication—that by sea—was by country boats, seldom available, and if obtained, little able to compete with the *Constance* (swift schooner) in which I proceeded to Cutch, it is morally impossible that you could, *prior* to my arrival there, have obtained any information whatever of the despatch of my Mission, or of the objects of that Mission.*

14. Your memory having proved so defective on this point, I might with confidence claim greater credit for my impressions of the conversation which passed at

* Colonel Melvill still adheres to his original statement, and assigns the reasons which he conceives to render it highly probable. But as has been already shown, the question of whether letters were or were not received is one utterly irrelevant to the dispute, unless by their production it can be shown that Outram has misstated the objects of his mission. That no letters tending in that direction could be produced is not only rendered probable by their non-production, but absolutely certain from the context of the case, as shown in several preceding notes, and in the very letter of Colonel Outram under annotation.

the Durbar than your very different version of the same is entitled to. And it is but natural, that occurrences of much importance to one, like myself, engaged on a first Mission, and which occurrences it was my business to remember for the purpose of reporting them to my Chief, should be vividly retained in my memory. They *are* indelibly impressed on my mind—to the effect faithfully detailed in my previous Letter. And I have no hesitation in declaring that your "recollections" of what passed at the Durbar, as well as of what passed between us after we left the Durbar, are utterly erroneous. But I shall not rest my claim to superior accuracy on these grounds alone; I will show that your version is opposed to reason and to probability.

15. It is unreasonable to suppose that Sir John Keane should—at a time when my services were so necessary at Head Quarters—have detached me to Cutch merely to convey complimentary messages to the Rao; to which you say my mission was restricted. It is unreasonable to suppose that a man of Sir John Keane's irritable temperament should, while chafing under difficulties which he attributed in some measure to the non-fulfilment of the Rao's promises, have thought of deputing an Aide-de-Camp with no other view than to convey complimentary messages to that Prince. It is improbable that, had "everything to be done in Cutch already been done," when you wrote to advise me to return to Sinde, I should have wasted the time, or exposed myself to the trouble of proceeding to Bhooj, merely to deliver the Commander-in-Chief's complimentary messages, which, in that case, I could have transmitted by letter, through *you*. And is it

probable, that even the half-hour to which (erroneously, I think) you limit my interview with the Rao, could have been occupied solely in exchanging complimentary messages?*

16. You assume, however, as confirmatory of your impression that I made no "appeals to His Highness in the name of the Commander-in-Chief," the absence of any mention in my "Rough Notes" of anything but "remembrances and good wishes," and of "cordial messages in reply." And this you say agrees exactly with your memory. If you can take the trouble to look through the little work referred to, you will observe that, as in this case, so on every subsequent occasion of my being deputed on confidential Missions (such as those to the Envoy and Minister with Shah Shoojah) I carefully abstain from detailing either the conversations that passed, or the more important objects in view:—restricting myself to stating merely the ostensible and publicly-avowed object. On this principle, my mention of the Cutch Mission is confined to stating only its complimentary purpose.†

---

* That it was *not* so, has been abundantly demonstrated by Col. Melvill himself.

† In this passage Colonel Outram has inadvertently, *and very obviously*, used "*Cutch Mission*" for "*interview with the Rao*," to whom alone he was charged with "complimentary messages." And Colonel Melvill, (as will hereafter be seen) avails himself of this very transparent inadvertence to charge Outram with self-contradiction; inasmuch as he had in his entry of the 29th December—the day he left the Army, four days before he reached Cutch, and six days before he had the "interview"—recorded the fact that "he was *dispatched by the Commander-in-Chief, in the Constance schooner, on a mission to Cutch, to procure assistance in land and water carriage!*" "Let me remind you,"—he triumphantly writes—"that your record of the mission was *not* confined to its complimentary purpose; you state its object to have been to procure assistance!"

17. With at least the same justice that you assume the omission in my "Rough Notes" of any mention of my "appeals" to the Rao, as evidence that no such appeals were made, may I assume your omitting to object, when my "Rough Notes" were submitted to you, to my mention of the "*arrangements* made with you in Cutch," as proof that the said arrangements *were* made. With this essential difference, however, that, while I was debarred by official etiquette from publishing my "appeals," you were not only quite unrestricted, and free to express your objections to anything my book contained, but the said book had actually been sent to you for the very purpose of eliciting your notice of any errors, if such should occur to you, with a view of correcting them prior to its republication in England. You admit that you did give your opinion in "general form," but think that you "possibly omitted, from a feeling of delicacy, to "refer to that part which concerned yourself." Such delicacy toward one with whom you were on such intimate terms as myself, and who had solicited your criticism, is perfectly inexplicable to me. And equally so is your indifference *then*, to a matter to which you *now* attach such vast importance.

18. You deny that I "*arranged* with you for any-"thing, if by *arrangement* I mean that anything was "done by means of my exertions, my influence, or my "advice." The object of my Mission being to incite the Rao to further efforts, and to arrange with you to obtain through His Highness additional carriage to the five hundred Camels already on their way; my *exertions* to that end, were the voyage and journey to Bhooj, and my "appeals" to the Rao. The *influence*

I exerted, was that of the Commander-in-Chief whom I represented. You yourself say I tendered *advice*; and though we differ as to its purport, it is obvious from the entry in my published Diary formerly quoted, that we *had* come to an understanding on the subject; and that I had *arranged* with you before I left Bhooj, "for the supply of five hundred additional Camels, "five hundred having already been sent off, viâ Lukput, "and (for) four hundred Pack Bullocks to be supplied "at Mandavie." I arranged with *you*, as doubtless you arranged with the Rao. Neither you nor I had actually to supply the animals; and possibly your own exertions may have been little greater than mine.

19. You ask if there is anything in the accounts of what passed in Cutch, as given in my "Rough Notes," to bear out the "inflated narrative of my expedition" given by "Kennedy." In reply, I will—in claiming credit for modestly narrating my "own deeds," borrow the words which you applied to yourself in your first letter,—"I have naturally felt the reluctance which "most men I conceive would feel, to put forward their "own deeds." In this spirit, I dwelt but lightly in my "Rough Notes" on my proceedings on the occasion referred to. For this, or anything else I did throughout the campaign, I claimed no credit. And in this spirit I should have rejected the extract from Kennedy's work when appended by Colonel Barnewall to the "Testimonials;" as also I should have caused it to be expunged from the "Memoir," (had it been submitted to my inspection before printing,) if the construction you put upon it had ever occurred to me. I should have sacrificed nothing to signify, thereby: for the utmost credit that can possibly accrue to me from the

said passage, amounts to such a mere trifle in the entire record of services put forward in my friend's "Memoir;" that its omission would, really, be of no consideration to me. But, neither my friends nor myself having ever dreamed of reflecting on your official character, by promulgating what was not supposed to apply to you individually;—and which we had no reason to imagine could be offensive to one who, residing at the same place—and associating—with the author of the paragraph when his publication first appeared, had not, at that time, made the slightest objection to it—I see no reason now for denouncing the passage as bearing the personally offensive interpretation which you now—at the eleventh hour—see fit to attach to it.

20. Neither can I concur in the propriety of suggesting to Mr. Kaye—as you desire—any further modification of the passage in his "History" to which you object, than what I have indicated in my previous Letter. For I do believe that the influence I exerted on behalf of the Commander-in-Chief, did stimulate—in some degree at least—the subsequent exertions of the Rao, to which we were indebted for further aid. And I know that the boats—and especially the large Flat, (which carried, I believe, almost the entire Siege Park and Magazine,) which I was the cause of procuring from Cutch, came most opportunely to assist in releasing the Army from its first position: to which end, water carriage was as necessary as Camels. Only in so far as Kaye attributes the *first* 500 Cutch Camels to any exertions of mine, is he in error. Had he expressed himself in general terms, without particular reference to Cutch, there would have been nothing to cavil at. For without the 1300 Sinde Camels, boats, and large Flat, which were secured

through my instrumentality, your Cutch Camels would have been useless. I told you I should request Mr. Kaye "in the preparation of the next edition of his "book, to obviate the misconception which you think, "the passage in question is likely to awaken;" and before leaving London I called at his lodgings for that purpose, but not finding him at home, left a note which I have no doubt will suffice to effect due rectification. But certainly I shall suggest nothing more. For were Mr. Kaye to adopt your view, that "*none* of the contributions of carriage from Cutch were "due to my exertions," he would again be amenable to the charge of incorrectness.

21. Not content, however, with representing my Mission to Cutch as an empty formality, you now desire, apparently, to create doubts as to even the Sinde Camels having been secured through any exertion of mine. "I know"—you say—"that 1000 or 1200 Camels "had previously been collected by Nao Mull under "Colonel Pottinger's orders, in Lower Sinde." But you do not add—as you might have done, for you could scarcely be ignorant of the fact—that, not one of all those Camels would have reached the Army, had I not, by unexpectedly landing at Kurrachee (then hostile,) and, passing in disguise through the country, suddenly appeared in the midst of the mob of Belooch Camel-owners whom Nao Mull had collected, just when—incited by emissaries from Hydrabad—they had determined to break with him; had placed him in personal danger; and were about to disperse with their animals. Through my efforts, and the pledges I conveyed to them from the British Chief, they were brought round to renew their engagements with Nao

Mull, and eventually to come to our Camp. It is quite true that the Kurrachee Hindoo Merchant, Nao Mull, had, at the instigation of Colonel Pottinger, undertaken to supply those Camels; but, I repeat, (what he himself admitted at the time), that he would have been utterly powerless to fulfil his undertaking, owing to the counteracting efforts of the Sinde Durbar, had I not so opportunely come to his aid and rescue. Even your own witness, Davidson, admits that my "presence at Kurrachee hastened Nao Mull's movements." He must have known at the time, if he has forgotten it now, that it was owing to my fortunate "presence" (not at Kurrachee, but in the Belooch Camel Camp) at the critical moment, that Nao Mull was enabled to effect anything. Had the Beloochees then gone off with their Camels, there would have been no possibility of recalling them while their Sindian rulers remained hostile. And so long as the Army was unable to advance (which it could not have done with your 500 Camels,) there was no chance of any change in their demeanour. Nao Mull, the only man who could otherwise have assisted us in Sinde, had he been allowed to escape scatheless, would have been a proscribed fugitive in the British Camp, with no influence beyond its pickets. Further supplies from Cutch would have been cut off. And our only resource would have been to await supplies of carriage from India by sea. Ere they could arrive, the season would have been so far advanced, as to preclude carrying out the objects of the Expedition for another year. And war with the Ameers could scarcely then have been avoided.

22. In disposing of this portion of your Letter, I have

been drawn into greater length than I intended. I shall only notice, therefore, two or three more of your remarkable declarations, and misconceptions.

23. Among the former, I class the extraordinary circumstance of your remaining ignorant of what Dr. Kennedy had published in 1840, till the year 1858. This you explain by saying you did not read the book, it being "a publication, you believe, of the time, of "little mark or importance." However slight the estimation that work may have met with elsewhere, it certainly—as the first published account of the Campaign—created considerable interest in India at the time it appeared. And I can positively assert, of my own knowledge, that it caused a very lively sensation throughout the Bombay Presidency, at least:—so much so, that I question whether there exists a single Military man then present in the Bombay Army—except yourself—who can declare that he did not read it, or hear it read. Be there any who from any cause were deterred from reading it, even they could scarcely avoid seeing the extracts from it with which the Bombay papers then teemed. And the particular extract which is now so obnoxious to you, I am almost certain appeared in the "Bombay Times," if not in all the others. The inexplicable circumstance of this passage then escaping your notice, either through personal observation or being told of it by your friends, is little less surprising, than the extraordinary freedom from the sensitiveness as to what is said of one's self—from which few human beings are exempt—which you so signally evinced, by abstaining from looking at a book the first few pages of which, you could not otherwise than surmise, would necessarily embrace the

transactions in which your Chief, (Colonel Pottinger,) and yourself were personally concerned. The absence of all curiosity on the subject, when you were comparatively young, and the events were of recent occurrence, is the more remarkable in one who now, at a more advanced age, displays such extreme sensitiveness respecting the reproduction, after the lapse of years, of an allusion to those events.

24. Almost equally surprising with the above, is your utter forgetfulness of a circumstance of which, at any rate, you were cognizant at the time, and which, though of trifling moment in itself, so far concerned the interests of one for whom you professed friendship, that it might well have found some place in your memory. In allusion to Lord Auckland, you observe that "probably my name and my mission were at the time "equally unknown" to his Lordship. Even had you not previously been informed—which it is not likely you could have been ignorant of, for the matter was no secret—of the circumstances under which I had been induced to relinquish a lucrative and important Political office to join the Army on Captain's pay, is it likely that I could have passed a day with you at Bhooj without mentioning—to a friend with whom I had no reserve—what I had reason to be so proud of: viz.—that I had been permitted to join the Army at the personal request of Lord Auckland himself, privately made to the Governor of Bombay; and that the Bombay Government, so far from ordering me to join because my Regiment was with the Force, were only induced to sanction my doing so because the Governor-General had expressly desired it:—they concurring in the regret expressed by the Commissioner for Guzerat,

at my departure from my post? I have no hesitation in declaring, that it is impossible I can have failed to allude to these circumstances when we met on that occasion. But, had I not done so, it is scarcely possible that you could have continued ignorant of the fact, when shortly afterwards you became Secretary to Government; particularly when that mark of Lord Auckland's favour was followed up by his Lordship's selecting me to succeed Sir Henry Pottinger in Sinde.

25. You assume that Colonel Barnewall and Captain Pontardent "could have had no means of information "from any other source than myself, and naturally "accepted what I presented to them as correct." This sentence involves two misconceptions. In the first place, Colonel Barnewall—not I—copied out with his own hand, for the printer to append to those Testimonials, such extracts from published works as he considered applicable; and among them was this passage from "Kennedy." In the second place, Captain Pontardent, so far from possessing no personal information as to what passed at the time referred to by Kennedy, was with the Army at the time, and of all men in that Army, perhaps, the one best capable of judging what was due to every individual concerned in those early transactions. And especially was he conversant with everything connected with Cutch, in which he took much interest from his long personal connection with that Province, and from his intimacy with the Cutch Camel-owners, who regarded him as their special protector in the Force—invariably appealing to him for advice or assistance on every occasion of difficulty.

26. It only remains for me to notice one error into

which it appears I have unwittingly fallen. You tell me I am mistaken in supposing that Dr. Kennedy was the personal friend of either Sir Henry Pottinger or yourself. Be it so—the point is immaterial—but such was certainly my impression until you assured me to the contrary.

27. I offer no observations on the letters of Sir Henry Pottinger and Major Davidson. Seeing only the one-sided view of the question contained in your Letter of the 4th May, which represented that my "Memoir" "reflected seriously on your zeal and public character, "by charging you and others," (Sir Henry himself being prominently at their head,) "with great neglect "and supineness,"—they could only be expected to answer as they did. If, as I assume to be the case, you received the printed copy of my Letter on the 6th August, I think I have reason to complain that—on requiring Sir Henry Pottinger's testimony respecting a matter of dispute between us—you did not place that letter before him with yours of the 8th August; you having previously sent to him that of 4th May, to which mine replied. Your letter of the 4th May alone being before Sir Henry, being calculated—without the explanations afforded in my reply—to prejudice and irritate, at least, if not to mislead him.*

28. Though your Letter has been ten days on my hands, I have only now been able to answer it, owing to the innumerable interruptions, and other calls upon my time, to which I have been exposed since I landed (on the 12th inst.); the many letters I had to prepare for the English Mail, which left on the 19th, and the replies I had to make to the communications from

* As has been already seen, Colonel Melvill declares that Colonel Outram's letter did not reach him until the 25th August.

my Indian friends which awaited my arrival. This I mention to account for the delay; though any apology need scarcely be necessary, as you appear to have had my letter just three weeks before you, at the date of your reply (27th September).

29. As I have yet a fair copy to prepare, for the purpose of transmitting it with your letter to my publishers by next mail, the further delay of two or three days may occur ere this letter be posted, for I have much else to occupy my time.

30. My London Agents will be instructed to append our present correspondence to what previously passed between us. On the whole being completed, a copy will be transmitted to every recipient of the "Memoir;" and twenty copies will be held at your disposal by Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co., which I rely on your doing me the justice to supply to the parties to whom you have shown your Letter of the 4th May. Lest you should have any further observations to make, however, Messrs. S. E. and Co. will be requested not to strike off the Pamphlet until they shall have heard from you. If you should have any thing further to say, in consequence of my present letter, Mr. Smith will append the same to the Pamphlet; *and should there be ought therein to call for comment, due attention thereto will be given, in a postscript, by the friends at home empowered to act for me. This will obviate the delay of any further correspondence between us on this subject, which, so far as I am concerned, I now consider CLOSED.**

I remain,

Yours truly,

(Signed) J. OUTRAM.

* These lines are italicised by the Editor.

P.S. I believe copies of the "Memoir" were sent to Battaye, Wallace, and Fulljames. If they have not been received, they must have been lost in the missing mail. If you desire to see it, either your brother James or your brother-in-law Colonel Ovans, can supply you with the copies I gave to them.

Second Postscript.

CALCUTTA, 27*th September*, 1853.

As I was about to close and despatch this packet yesterday, I received your note of the 15th instant.

In that note you inform me that you have "since "fulfilled the intention you had therein" (your Letter dated 27th ultimo) "expressed, and have had our "correspondence printed" and circulated.

In the Letter referred to, you intimated to me, that "before you left India" you would "probably print, &c."

Not being aware that you purpose leaving India so immediately as to prevent the possibility of an answer being obtained from me to your communication of the 27th ultimo, I am at a loss to understand what necessity could have arisen for such precipitancy in the matter.

The early Mail of this month announced, in Bombay, that I had passed Aden on my way to Calcutta. When your note of the 15th was written, therefore, you were aware that, by that time, I had arrived in India, and was in a position to answer your previous letter. When *that* letter was penned by you, it was not known when I should return; the chances were that I should be detained in Egypt, or employed in

Turkey, for some time to come; and the probability was, that I should never see your letter. The sudden resolution you appear to have come to, to print off and circulate our correspondence terminating with your *unanswered* letter, at the *very time* when you no longer could have any doubt that you would receive an early reply to that letter, *is so opposed to the straightforward procedure of a controversialist conscious of a good cause, and so opposed to the course I had pursued towards you, that I certainly cannot bring myself to follow such an example; and the pages of my Pamphlet are still freely open to you* IN THE MANNER INDICATED IN MY LETTER."*

You now inform me that my Letter of the 23rd June only reached you on the 25th July.† This detention of my Letter is a mystery I cannot fathom, but I have taken effectual steps to clear it up.‡

"Note" from Colonel Melvill, referred to above:—

KIRKEE, 15th Sept., 1853.

MY DEAR OUTRAM,

I wrote to you on the 27th ultimo, in reply to your Letter of the 23rd June, which reached me only

---

* These lines are italicised by the Editor.

† August is meant.

‡ Colonel Outram requested his Agents to supply an affidavit to the effect that the Letter (containing a printed copy of the Letter of the 23rd) only received by Colonel Melvill on the 25th of August, had been posted for the mail of the 4th of July. But their "Register" of the Overland Letters of their constituents did not enable them to identify the particular one referred to, so positively as to authorize them to make the desired affidavit.

on the 25th ultimo. I sent my Letter to Leckie and Co., in Bombay, to be forwarded, and I hope it reached you in proper course.*

I have since fulfilled the intention I therein expressed, and have had our correspondence on the subject of the carriage supplied from Cutch to Sir John Keane's force in Sinde, printed. My sole object is to give to it the same circulation as the Memoir (to which it refers) has obtained.†

---

* Although Colonel Melvill had never perused Dr. Kennedy's book, and seems not to have read even Mr. Kaye's until May 1853, he is generally understood to be a pretty attentive reader of the newspapers. And even if it were otherwise—even if he had not seen the announcement in the Bombay journals, of the 3rd of September, that Outram was passenger in the steamer likely to reach Calcutta somewhere about the 12th of that month—it is odd that he should have failed to hear of it. For that Officer's journey to Calcutta, the Editor is in a position to prove, was much talked of at Poona, where Colonel Melvill then resided. And far from Outram being an object of indifference to Colonel Melvill's *friends* in local power at that time, the Editor is equally in a position to prove that these gentlemen were bestowing no small attention on his movements. It is difficult, therefore, to understand why Col. Melvill was not aware, when penning these words, that the *unanswered* letter to which he referred, *could not* have been more than two or three days in Colonel Outram's hands. But if he *did* believe that the Letter had been longer in his correspondent's hands, the less excusable is the precipitancy to which he pleads guilty in the next paragraph

† We have seen that up to the 27th of August Colonel Melvill had been unable to discover that a single copy of the "Memoir" had reached Bombay. And even if in the meantime he *had* heard that copies had been received, it would have been only fair to defer publication until Outram's answer had been received. If obliged to leave, himself, before the letter reached him, he might have safely relied on the good services of any of his friends to take care of his correspondence, and, when complete, to circulate the requisite copies in Bombay, and forward the rest to England. It *was* possible, even under the circumstances, that a reply might come before the 28th of September, the day fixed for Colonel Melvill's departure. And if Colonel Melvill *did* expect that his letter had "*reached in proper course*," the probability was *very* strong that the

With this view I have forwarded copies by the last mail to my brothers, and to Colonel Ovans; and I have directed ten copies to be despatched to yourself, by Banghy Dak, which I trust you will distribute to those who may have received the Memoir in Calcutta.

I regret much that this correspondence should have arisen between us, but, on my part, I consider it to have been unavoidable.

Believe me,

Yours truly,

(Signed) P. M. MELVILL.

[On the 24th November—in the midst of the bustle of a departing Overland Mail—Colonel Melvill forwarded the subjoined letter to Colonel Outram's publishers, to be annexed to the antecedent correspondence, which, as he had learned from Colonel Outram, they were instructed to print, in Outram's behalf, and with the view of neutralizing the injustice that had been done him by the publication of Colonel's Melvill's *ex parte* and incomplete copy. In conveying his wishes to the publishers, Colonel Melvill quoted so much of Colonel Outram's letter as showed that he was authorized to make additional observations; but he neglected to cite the passage in which certain conditions had been attached to the exercise of this privilege. And he "*distinctly desired that his letter should not be shown to any third party, prior to its publication, or until it had been seen by Colonel Outram himself.*" To the publishers, who had more important and profitable occupation than the perusal of a dreary and verbose correspondence on "Cutch Carriage," both the request and the cited authority appeared unexceptionable. The letter was put in type; and only an accident prevented its being sent forth, ostensibly under Colonel Outram's sanction, and uncommented on by him or his friends.

Colonel Outram had been too busy to send manuscript copies of his letter of the 27th September even to those friends whom he had

---

reply would reach Bombay several days before the 28th. Yet the Pamphlet was not only out of the printer's hands on the 14th, but on its way to England.

requested to examine Colonel Melvill's additional "observations." He accordingly instructed the publishers to forward to his friends early proofs of the printed copy; and in doing so the publishers felt it necessary to account for a hiatus in the proofs, by explaining that they had, in obedience to their constituent's authorization, printed another letter from Colonel Melvill, which that officer had interdicted them from showing to any third party. On this, their attention was directed to the fact that Colonel Melvill's letter to them had conveyed a very erroneous impression: that he had *never* been authorized to add a single line to the correspondence (at that time consisting of an equal number of "attacks" and "vindications,") without submitting it to the comments of Colonel Outram's friends. Much time was occupied in the deliberations of the latter, as to the course to be pursued; and in the interval Colonel Melvill, who never seems to have for a moment doubted the success of his application to the publishers, wrote to them to ascertain why copies had not been sent to him. In reply he was reminded of the real facts of the case. Messrs Smith, Elder, and Co. hoped "he would feel as they did, the force of their observations; and they trusted that, under the circumstances, he would not desire to avail himself of Colonel Outram's offer to print the letter, while he denied him the opportunity (which Colonel Outram evidently concluded would be afforded, as a matter of course), of making, through his friends here, any remarks that might be called for in Colonel Melvill's letter." And they concluded with expressing a hope that the interdiction might be removed.

This proposition Colonel Melvill instantly rejected, on the alleged ground that "in a publication purporting to be a correspondence between Colonel Outram and himself, printed for private circulation, the introduction of 'remarks,' 'comments,' or 'explanations,' by any other person must be wholly out of place, and must entirely change its character." It never seems to have occurred to him that the correspondence was equitably *completed* by Colonel Outram's last letter; that that Officer had emphatically declined to correspond further on the subject; that the permission accorded to himself was not to write *letters*, but to make any "observations" on the letter of the 27th September which he deemed just to himself: and that the object of Colonel Outram's publication was not to enable the world to see how much he was inferior to Colonel Melvill as an elegant writer and adroit controversialist, but to set himself right in respect of certain unjust allegations and insinuations, which Colonel Melvill had for months put in circulation. But the latter did not see the matter in this light. He conceived there were "only two plain courses open—either to print the correspondence complete to its present termination,"—that is to say, send his last offensive letter into circulation under Outram's auspices, and without protest from his friends; "or to await a further communication from Col. Outram

himself;"—in other words to prevent Colonel Outram's reply to the letter of the 26th August, (which had been circulating since September, 1853), making its appearance until February or March, 1854! There was, however, *another plan:* it was to refuse to publish Col. Melvill's letter at all, *and to explain in a preface the circumstances which rendered this measure expedient.* But Colonel Outram's friends conceived it to be a more dignified course, and one more consistent with the character and tastes of the injured and absent officer, to give Colonel Melvill the advantage of a further and unchallenged circulation of his pamphlet, and to await Colonel Outram's instructions.]

LONDON, 23*rd November*, 1853.

DEAR OUTRAM,

I have received (on the 18th instant,) your Letter of the 24th September.

Before I proceed to follow you through your discursive paragraphs, and to expose the inaccurate and fallacious premises on which your arguments are based, I desire, in order that attention may not be diverted from the main and indeed the only points really in dispute between us to those which are non-essential and of minor or of no importance, to repeat, in the words of my first Letter to you,—"that you never "laboured at the Cutch Durbar,—that there were no "points at that Court or in that country left undone "when they ought to have been done, or left to your "management when you visited Bhooj, in 1838;" and further, in the terms of my second Letter, that with the possible and trivial exception therein specified, neither then nor at any subsequent time was any carriage whatever procured by your exertions in Cutch; and not a Camel reached Sir J. Keane's force

that would not have reached it, and at precisely the same period, had you never entered the province at all. I admit your *exertions* to the extent of your voyage in the *Constance* to Mandavie, and your journey (no very laborious one), to Bhooj; but I distinctly deny that anything whatever was effected, within the sphere of my charge, "by means of your efforts, your "influence, or your advice."

These are my positions, which you vainly endeavour to controvert by reasoning on mistaken assumptions, and erroneous premises—by the introduction of irrelevant matters—and by references to occurrences of other times and places. These, I say, are my positions, and I continue to maintain them in all their original integrity.

You have impugned the accuracy of my recollections relative to the conversation we together held with the Rao; and yet those recollections accord exactly with your own account of what occurred, as registered in your "Rough Notes."* You *now* tell me, indeed, that you restricted yourself to recording only the ostensible and publicly avowed object of your mission, which was its "complimentary purpose;" and

* Why! Colonel Melvill had, himself, in each of his antecedent letters, *most distinctly* proved that his recollections did NOT accord with Outram's account of what occurred, as registered in his "Rough Notes!" For, according to the "recollections" of the former, "*mention was made*" of that distressed condition of the Army which had led to Outram being demitted to Cutch. According to the same authority, Outram had made "*suggestions*" on behalf of the Army, which the other had availed himself of his temporary position to "negative;" whereas, Colonel Melvill, only a few pages back, had made it an argument against Outram, that "in his own Diary no mention is made of anything but 'remembrances and good wishes,' and of cordial messages in reply," &c.

that all the rest was locked up in your own breast. Let me remind you, however, that your record of the mission is not confined to its complimentary purpose; you state its object to have been "to procure assistance in land and water carriage," and so no doubt it was: I never for a moment supposed it otherwise.* I assert that your mission *resulted* only in a complimentary message to the Rao; but Sir J. Keane's intention in deputing you is plain enough and intelligible enough without the addition which you now append, of appeals which were wholly unnecessary, and of remonstrances which would have been altogether out of place. I am positive that I *did* receive letters from the General, informing me of his requirements and wishes. It is morally impossible that Sir J. Keane should have deputed his Aide-de-Camp on a mission to consult and to act with a Political Officer not under his orders, and have failed to write to inti-

* As has been already noticed, Colonel Outram inadvertently used the word "*mission*," when he meant to refer only to his "*interview with the Rao*," in reference to which, (as in reference to *all* his official interviews with personages of rank or importance) he had carefully abstained from recording what had passed when preparing for the printer the "*Rough Notes*," which, at the solicitation of his friends, he was induced to publish in 1840. Of this fact Colonel Melvill, whose letters prove that he has had frequent recourse to that little volume, was necessarily aware. It has been already explained, that the words here quoted by Colonel Melvill, as if they referred to the "interview," were written six days before that event —four days before Outram landed at Mandavie. Why did Col. Melvill, when availing himself of his correspondent's obvious inadvertence, not cite the entries relating to the boats, camels, bullocks, &c.? These would have been more to the point than the few words he quotes—but they would also have reminded the reader, that from 1841 until 1853, Colonel Melvill had himself tacitly admitted that Outram's mission *did* "*result*" in something considerably more important than "a complimentary message to the Rao!"

mate the deputation. By what course the letters reached me, I cannot, at this distance of time, exactly say. I believe them to have been brought to Mandavie, if not by yourself, in the same vessel with yourself, and to have been forwarded to me by Captain Ward:—But there is nothing *impossible* in the supposition that they were conveyed overland; the communication at the time was perfectly open and uninterrupted; it was a part of my duty to keep it so, and it was often very rapid.*

With regard to the circumstances attending your transfer from your appointment in the Mhye Kanta to the staff of Sir J. Keane, I can only remark that the version you give of those circumstances is quite novel to me, and widely different from that which has hitherto dwelt in my memory. It has never concerned me to enquire particularly into the story. I certainly recollect your expressing your sense of obligation to a relative of mine for assisting you in some recent difficulties, and to Sir J. Keane for receiving you upon his Staff; but I do not recollect your mentioning Lord Auckland in connection with yourself. It is, however, a matter of no moment, for whether Lord Auckland

* If the communication between the Army and Bhooj was so open and uninterrupted, it is the more wonderful that, aware of Sir John Keane's straitened condition—having all the resources of Cutch at his disposal—and being responsible for the application of these resources to Sir John's service — Colonel Melvill did not contrive to forward to him additional supplies of carriage. Yet though Outram visited Bhooj on the morning of the 3rd December, the Army was not enabled to march until the 24th; and the only contribution it had then received from Colonel Melvill, appears to have been the 500 camels, so long detained on the frontier, and which had been dispatched from Bhooj before the Commander-in-chief left Bombay—and therefore long before he found himself embarrassed.

were acquainted with your *name* or not, it is perfectly clear that he could not have been acquainted with your mission, or have directed or sanctioned it by his high authority. I must observe, further, that at the period in question I was not in the relation to you of "a friend with whom you had no reserve." We then had met scarcely half a dozen times, and all our intimacy was of a date some years subsequent.*

I have told you that I never read Dr. Kennedy's work; and this assertion on my part you evidently seek to invalidate by arguing upon its improbability.† Nevertheless I repeat it: I have never read Dr. Ken-

* Be this as it may, Colonel Melvill, for several "years subsequent," professed a *very warm* regard for Outram. And it is certainly remarkable, that neither as the Military Secretary of Government, nor as Outram's friend, should he have heard of matters tolerably well known to many not enjoying either of these advantages. Hardly less remarkable is it that he should, in "subsequent years," have contracted a friendship for an Officer who, in 1840, had promulgated "*erroneous stories*," for the purpose of enhancing his own reputation; one, moreover, of whom the Bombay newspapers had also from time to time circulated the same "erroneous story," and who, "on each recurrence of the tale falsely told by his friends, for the purpose of enhancing the merit of *his* services," failed to give it the "contradiction" for which Colonel Melvill had "looked."—(Page 84.)

† Colonel Outram had *not* sought to invalidate the assertion. But he *had*—as was his undoubted right—expressed his astonishment, that the Military Secretary, who, by his own accounts, had rendered good service to the Affghan expedition, should not have read the first narrative of it given to the public, though that narrative was the work of a brother Officer, a fellow townsman, and one with whom he necessarily had official intercouse. He very properly disallowed Colonel Melvill's attempt to account for this extraordinary circumstance by depreciating the reputation of that work, and the local attention it awakened. And he logically insisted, that despite the Military Secretary's unlooked for disregard of the current literature of Indian politico-military matters, his attention must necessarily have been drawn by others to the obnoxious passage, if it had been in any way understood to reflect on himself.

nedy's work, (nor did the passage which has originated this correspondence ever meet my eye, until extracted for my information from the Memoir of your services, published by Dr. Ogilvie,) and moreover, I can assure you that you are mistaken in supposing that in this ignorance of the contents of the book I form a solitary exception to all the Military men of the Presidency. On the contrary, but few to whom I have spoken regarding it are in the least acquainted with it; and I conceive I am right in describing it as a production of little mark or consideration.

As to the construction put upon the passage in question, I continue of opinion that that which I have placed upon it, is the only one of which it is obviously and reasonably susceptible. With any reflections cast upon the government of Mr. Farish, or upon Sir J. Keane as a member of that government, I have no immediate concern; and I have no objection whatever to admit your assurance, that you did not view the passage as reflecting upon me. Nevertheless, you do not deny that it may bear that construction, and therefore, unless prepared to defend its accuracy, it was, I conceive, your duty to correct it.* You comment upon

* Colonel Outram had said, "On more attentively considering that passage than I had done before you raised the question regarding it—*for*, deeming the matter of little importance, and thinking of no other application than I have now given, I certainly never critically scanned it,—I must now admit it is *also* liable to be misunderstood, *by any one predisposed so to regard it.* But I repeat what I said in my former letter, 'it never once occurred to me to put on it that construction.'" And in the "former letter" Colonel Outram had handsomely undertaken to cause explanation to be made to all recipients of his "Memoir," that such a construction—a construction which implied that the passage was intended to be depreciatory, either of Colonel Pottinger or Colonel Melvill—was erroneous. Colonel Melvill himself—*and only himself*—was to blame that such explanation had not been given.

my former apathy and present sensitiveness; and to these comments I reply as I have done before,—that so long as the misrepresentation was confined to ascribing to you the merit of doing what was done by myself, I cared not to notice it; but when your eulogists ventured to impeach my public character in order to enhance your alleged services, then it became my bounden duty to stand forward, and denounce the error.

I do not intend to be drawn into any discussion as to what you did, or did not, with reference to the Camels collected in Lower Sind. I have already stated the sum of my knowledge: viz., that twelve or thirteen hundred camels were collected in Lower Sind by Nao Mull, under the instructions of Sir Henry Pottinger; and I leave it to others to decide whether your "fortunate presence" at Kurachee prevented the batch from dispersion, and secured it for the Army.*

Lastly, with respect to the dates which you appear to have confused, if you will refer to my Letter of the 27th August, you will perceive that I therein distinctly told you that your Letter of the 23rd June reached me, for the first time, on the 26th August. All your reasoning, therefore, on the assumption that I received the copy of your Letter on the 6th August, falls to the ground. By the Mail which was delivered in Bombay on the 6th August, I received no communication whatever from you; but I heard from more than one quarter, that the passage in Dr. Ogilvie's Memoir

* It is rather amusing in Colonel Melvill to decline "being drawn into discussion" with an Officer who had *peremptorily* declined holding any further correspondence with him; who, two months before, had declared the correspondence to be "*closed*," as regarded himself.

was a quotation from Dr. Kennedy's work; and this enabled me to state the fact to Sir Henry Pottinger, in my Letter to him of the 9th August. Sir Henry Pottinger has long been in possession of your Letter to me of the 23rd June, and I know that it has occasioned no change whatever in his opinions.*

Your postscript I confess myself unable to understand. You appear to wish to fasten upon me a charge of having acted unfairly towards you, in printing my Letter to you of the 27th August, without waiting for your answer to it. You seem to forget that you caused your Letter to me of the 23rd June, to be printed long before it was possible I could have seen it.† But, without dwelling upon this, I will merely observe, that I gave you the amplest opportunity of correcting the misstatement put forward in the Memoir of your Services.‡ I waited long, in the hope that you would avail yourself of that opportunity; and when at last your Letter found its way to my hands and showed me that I had hoped and waited in vain, no other course remained for me than that which I adopted. I feel well assured that my

---

* It was hardly to be expected, that after Sir Henry had so rashly committed himself to the endorsement of Colonel Melvill's inadvertent statements, he would readily declare his mistake.

† Yes! But only that it might be shown to those amongst whom Colonel Melvill had circulated *his* offensive letter, without waiting for his correspondent's reply. And although Colonel Outram, along with his reply, printed the letter which had elicited it, we have seen how his object in invoking the printer's aid was frustrated by Colonel Melvill.

‡ It is not wonderful that Colonel Melvill feels inclined to avoid "*dwelling upon this.*" The unpleasant features thus slurred over will be found detailed in Part I of the Introduction.

course has been plain and straightforward throughout; whether yours has been of a similar character your own conscience may determine.

And now I have done. I have answered every part of your communication which calls for notice or reply. I neither retract nor qualify an iota of all that I have advanced. I have not trusted solely to my recollections; I have appealed to the only *living* witnesses who have a personal knowledge of the transactions in question. Had they been alive, I would have appealed, with equal confidence in the result, to Lord Keane himself and to Captain Pontardent; and I might have referred to the records of the Government.* But I am quite satisfied to let the case

* It is difficult to understand why, if Colonel Melvill thought the Records of Government would have aided him, he did not obtain the permission of his friend, Lord Falkland, to make use of them. There was little chance of *his* application being refused. As has been already noticed, neither Sir H. Pottinger nor Colonel Davidson *had, or could possibly have had*, the SLIGHTEST personal knowledge of what passed between Outram, Captain Melvill, Captain Ward, and the Rao of Cutch in December, 1838; and the *hypothetical* appeal to two dead officers is quite as ineffective. It was Captain Pontardent, a friend of Colonel Melvill, and a participator in the campaign, who, in co-operation with another of Colonel Melvill's friends (Colonel Barnewall), *first extracted and published the very passage in Dr. Kennedy's book, to which Colonel Melvill takes exception.* And had Sir John Keane been aware, in 1838, of *all* that Colonel Melvill now asserts in 1853, he would have probably taken measures which would have prevented the Assistant Political Agent at Bhooj from becoming Military Secretary to the Bombay Government, notwithstanding the preponderating influence and patronage supposed to be exercised by the family of that gentleman. Far from having "appealed to the only living witnesses," Colonel Melvill's letters are simply appeals against the testimony—for thirteen years published, and for thirteen years unassailed—of one of the most intelligent "witnesses" of the campaign; the Medical Chief of the Army who carefully observed, investigated, and recorded in his journal, all that

rest as it is. I regard this letter as final; and in here closing the correspondence, I commit the matter between us to the judgment of our mutual friends, and of all impartial and unprejudiced men.

In compliance with your request, I have communicated a copy of this letter to Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co., in order that it may be printed together with yours; but I have interdicted them from shewing my letter to any third party prior to its being printed or seen by you.*

Believe me,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) P. M. MELVILL.

CALCUTTA, 17th Jan. 1854.

MY DEAR MELVILL,

I did not receive your Letter of the 23rd November in time to notice it by last mail; nor do I now purpose *replying* to *it*, having already, on the 24th September last, declined further correspondence with you on the matter respecting which you have again addressed me. On that occasion I informed you that

---

occurred, and all that was discussed in Camp, with the express object of publishing a book. The only "living witnesses" of what occurred during Outram's visit to Bhooj, are that officer and Colonel Melvill. And as has been already shown, the latter, while impugning, has satisfactorily confirmed the testimony of the former.

* "*In compliance with your request, &c,*"—"*But I have interdicted, &c.*"—Probably, in the whole history of controversy (as between "officers and gentlemen,") nothing half so curious as this has been witnessed.

" If you should have anything further to say in " consequence of my present Letter, Mr. Smith will " append the same to the Pamphlet; and *should there* " *be aught therein to call for comment, due attention will* " *be given in a postscript*, by the friends at home " authorised *to act for me. This will* OBVIATE THE " DELAY of any further *correspondence between us*, " *which*, AS FAR AS I AM CONCERNED, I NOW CONSIDER " CLOSED."

I did not choose to name those friends to you; but I informed you that they could be communicated with through my wife, now in England.*

Under these circumstances, I cannot understand why, on furnishing Messrs. Smith, Elder, & Co. with a copy of your Letter " in order," as you state, " that it may be printed together with yours (mine)," you should have " interdicted them from showing my " (your) Letter to any third party, prior to its being " printed or seen by you (me)."

It is not for me to reconcile your heretofore earnestly expressed desire that the recipients of the " Memoir " should be early put in possession of our correspondence, with the unnecessary delay thus interposed by you to their being furnished with it. And your procedure is the more inconsistent with the extreme haste with which you had yourself already circulated your own incomplete version of our correspondence, and even placed a copy (or permitted a

* Colonel Outram's disinclination to name his friends arose from his unwillingness to expose them to the disadvantages generally considered in the Service as inevitably accruing to those who may be unfortunate enough to incur the ill-will of a gentleman so powerful, both at Bombay and at the India House, as Colonel Melvill.

copy to be placed) in the hands of an Editor of an Indian newspaper (the Bombay Gazette, in which a one-sided article, founded thereon, appeared two days after your departure from Bombay).

I have not yet heard from Messrs. S. E. & Co. what steps they adopted in consequence of your communication to them;* but I trust they must have considered themselves bound to obtain your sanction to deliver a copy of your Letter to Mrs. Outram, when requested by Dr. Ogilvie, on my behalf, to do so; or that you yourself furnished that gentleman with it on the application he informs me he made to you, when, at the same time, he intimated to you that he is one of the friends deputed to act for me in my absence.† I cannot bring myself to suppose that you could refuse my friend's application. (Being then in Scotland, he had not received your reply when he wrote to me on the 5th ultimo.) But, lest this should now happen, I shall send your Letter to Dr. Ogilvie by this mail, with a request that he will—in consultation with my other friends—deal with it or comment on it as he and they may think proper; exercising their own discretion as to the form, &c., in which the pamphlet is to be completed; for I peremptorily decline myself again to address you on the subject.

If you wish to add anything further to what you

---

* Neither have I yet heard from them or from Mrs. Outram by this mail; their letters having been directed, probably, to Bombay. You effectually debarred them from the possibility of writing by the previous mail, your Letter being dated the 23*rd*, the very day before it left London; and its reply only furnished to Messrs. S. E. & Co. next day (the 24th) as I learn from Dr. Ogilvie.—JAMES OUTRAM.

† A letter was written; but, on consultation with others, it was withheld.

have already written, Mr. Smith will insert it—subject to the comments of my friends—but on no other condition.

Yours, faithfully,

(Signed) J. OUTRAM.

[On receipt of this letter in the end of February or beginning of March, it was considered by Colonel Outram's friends, that after the enormous delay which had occurred, it was hardly advisable to take any further steps in the matter. They had heard sufficient to satisfy them that Colonel Melvill's efforts to damage his *quondam* friend had been voted a bore in some quarters, and laughed at in others. And as the Compiler of the "Memoir" had been urged by many to bring out and *publish* a new edition of his little book, it was conceived that it would be a more dignified course to depute to him the task of setting Colonel Outram right in the eyes of those who had received Colonel Melvill's *incomplete* copy of the correspondence. But when they saw Colonel Melvill's last letter to Colonel Outram—the letter now subjoined—they deemed it their duty to take effectual steps to render it impossible for the friends of the former gentleman to represent the latter as having shrunk from his promise to give full publicity to the correspondence. And they at the same time considered it advisable that the correspondence should be so fully annotated, as to enable even careless readers to detect at once any reproduction of the fallacies it contains, on the subject of Cutch Carriage, that Colonel Melvill or his friends might hereafter see fit to reproduce.

To the subjoined letter Colonel Outram returned no answer. And a perusal of it will satisfy the reader that no answer was deserved.]

LONDON, 21st March, 1854.

DEAR OUTRAM,

I received your letter of the 17th January on the 3rd instant.

From the communication which I made to Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co., in reply to their note to me of

the 15th December, (a copy of which has, I presume, been transmitted to you), you will have understood the reason why, on furnishing your publishers with a copy of my letter to you of the 23rd of November last, I interdicted them from showing it to any third party, prior to its being printed or seen by you. The propriety and justice of this procedure, on my part appear to me so self-evident, that I am surprised they did not occur to your mind in the first instance, and I shall be still more surprised, if, on reflection, you fail to see and to acknowledge their force.

You are mistaken in supposing that I ever received a request from Dr. Ogilvie to sanction the delivery of a copy of my letter to you of the 23rd November into the hands of Mrs. Outram. No such request ever reached me; but to any such application, from whatever quarter it might have proceeded, I should certainly have returned the same answer as that which I gave to Messrs. Smith and Elder.*

You remark upon the extreme haste with which you assume I circulated what you are pleased to term my incomplete version of our correspondence. I have already shewn you, that in printing the correspondence so far as it had proceeded up to the time I left India,

* In other words, Colonel Melvill having taken what Colonel Outram considered an unfair advantage of him by circulating an imperfect and uncompleted correspondence, and having thus compelled Colonel Outram to publish—*in his own interest and on his own behalf*—a COMPLETE edition of that correspondence, proceeded to take the liberty of instructing that officer's agents to act to the prejudice of their constituent, and in obvious violation of his instructions, by publishing *another unanswered letter, containing allegations against him*—a letter which, until published, was to be withheld even from the wife of the officer whom Colonel Melvill had thus treated, and in whose name and at whose expense it was to be published!

I only followed your example, since you printed my original communication to you, and your first reply, without my rejoinder, in England, just before you quitted London.*

I have confined the circulation of the Pamphlet by myself to personal friends,† but it is very probable that copies may have obtained a wider range, and have fallen, among others, into the hands of Editors of newspapers; I deny, however, the assertion you hazard, that I either placed a copy in the hands of the Editor of the Bombay Gazette, or gave permission for a copy to be so placed; and if, as you state, an article founded thereon appeared two days after my departure from Bombay in that paper, I can only say that I never saw and never heard of such an article; and have remained, until the receipt of your letter, utterly ignorant of its existence.

You tell me that you have sent my letter to you of

---

* *Without my rejoinder!* Does Colonel Melvill consider that Colonel Outram should have had mesmeric prevision on the 23rd of June, of what was to be written on the 27th of the following August? Or does he think that with such prevision Colonel Outram would have been so foolish as to circulate without contradiction, statements which he regarded as unfounded? The correspondence printed by Colonel Outram, was, *a complete correspondence so far as it went.* It contained Colonel Melvill's *attack*, and Colonel Outram's *reply.* Not so with Colonel Melvill's publication, whose maxim, throughout this controversy, has been to secure both the *first* and the *last* word, to take care that he should always have one more printed manifesto before the public than his opponent—one unanswered letter to appeal to. And, as has been seen, Colonel Melvill, by failing to provide Mrs. Outram with the "*Names and Addresses*" of those to whom he had shown his letter of the 4th May, had taken care to render her husband's printed copies of the two letters practically useless.

† A multitudinous body, apparently. Why were their names not given?

the 23rd November to Dr. Ogilvie, with a reques
that "he will, in consultation with your other friend to
deal with it and comment on it as he and the an
may think proper;" and you add, "for I peremp—
torily decline myself again to address you (me) on th
subject."

To this I reply, that I as peremptorily decline t
admit the interference of any third party in our cor
respondence, or to accept the remarks and comment
which your friends may choose to make upon it, a
emanating from yourself.* To the contents of letter
addressed to me by you, I am always ready to pa
due attention; so long as your letters contain matte
which I consider to require from me explanation
correction, or contradiction, I shall continue to address
you in answer; but I will not consent to carry on
correspondence with you through proxies; and i
therefore rests with yourself whether this letter be the
last to pass between us or not.†

* Neither Col. Outram nor his friends desired that the "remarks or comments" of the latter should be accepted as emanating from the former. But Colonel Outram's friends claim, and mean to exercise, the right of criticising any attacks that may be made on him in his absence; more especially after a channel for these attacks has been sought in a pamphlet printed under the orders and in the interest of the assailed and absent man. And it is satisfactory to them to have so explicit a promise from Colonel Melvill that he will neither resent, nor attempt to resent their criticisms, as "emanations" from Colonel Outram.

† From this one might reasonably infer that it was a kindness to Colonel Outram to prolong the controversy! How stand the facts? On the 27th September, 1853, Colonel Outram informed Colonel Melvill that he *absolutely declined* corresponding with him further on this subject; *that as regards himself the correspondence was* "CLOSED." On receipt of this communication, Colonel Melvill wrote a letter which he hoped to induce Colonel Outram's agents to send forth to the public in that officer's pamphlet, and with all its allega-

I take this opportunity of acknowledging your note to me of the 2nd October last. I accept your apology,* and have no hesitation in declaring, that in the par-

tions unexamined. And in this letter—to himself doubtless a very agreeable termination to the correspondence—he announced that he "regarded this letter as *final*, and *here* closed the correspondence." He was disappointed in his expectation to have this letter circulated by Colonel Outram's agents. After the unavoidable lapse of three months he receives a communication from Colonel Outram, who, indignantly protesting against Colonel Melvill's conduct, and resolutely adhering to his previously declared refusal to prolong the correspondence, intimates that he will leave his friends in England to treat in the manner they deem best, both the letter of the 23rd November, and the strange circumstances under which its *ex parte* publication was attempted. And *then* Colonel Melvill, forgetful alike of his own and Outram's "*finality*" declarations, blandly offers to prolong the strife of words, and thus interminably aggravate the injustice of the delays against which Outram had protested. In doing so he is pleased to assume that such is his correspondent's wish; and he generously refrains from attaching to the gratification of his friend's odd whim any stipulation more onerous than that the correspondence shall *not* be conducted "by proxies," but directly—*in other words, that three months should pass between each letter!*

However flattered Colonel Outram's friends might very reasonably feel by being admitted to terms of correspondence with Colonel Melvill on other and more agreeable topics, they are *not* ambitious of holding proxies for *any one* in an epistolary controversy on "Cutch Carriage." And the remarks they offer through the editor of this pamphlet are not intended for Colonel Melvill, but for the friends of his correspondent.

* The "apology" here alluded to, was contained in the subjoined Letter, from which it will be seen that it refers to nothing that appears in the foregoing Correspondence:

MY DEAR MELVILL,

On re-considering the letter which I addressed to you on the 24th instant, I feel constrained to request your permission to expunge one passage which further reflection has satisfied me is scarcely warranted by the expression in your letter which elicited it. The following is the passage I refer to:—

"Passing by the doubt of my veracity here implied, the more "readily as I feel that in disposing of your present letter it will "be my unpleasant duty somewhat similary to question the truth-"fulness of your own statements and recollections."

ticular passage you cite, I had not the least intention of calling your veracity in question, and it never occurred to me that such a construction could be put upon my words.

Believe me,

Yours truly,

(Signed) P. M. MELVILL.

I had construed your words to which I refer, as implying doubts of my veracity. This, I think, I had no right to assume, for such may not have been intended by you. In that case my expressions reflecting on yourself, would be so gratuitously offensive, that I regret they should, in the heat of controversy, have escaped me, and I am desirous, therefore, to withdraw them, should you have no objection.

In the copy of my letter, which goes home by this mail, I have marked the passage to be omitted; should Messrs. Smith, Elder, & Co. hear nothing from you to the contrary by the Mail which leaves Bombay on the 17th instant, two or three days before the departure of which you will, I calculate, receive this note.

I remain,

Yours truly,

J. OUTRAM.

Digitized with financial assistance from
NSDL
Technology, Trust & Reach
on 07 January, 2017